

Kossuth Day

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 15, is the 120th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848. It is appropriate and fitting to observe this anniversary in the United States of America where one of the leaders of the revolution—Lajos Kossuth—was enthusiastically welcomed after he fled from his oppressors following the defeat of the Hungarian freedom fighters.

When the news of the February revolt in Paris and of the mass demonstrations in Vienna on March 13 reached Budapest, a young poet, Sandor Petofi, was inspired to write a poem dedicated to Hungarian nationalism. His fellow revolu-

tionaries—poets, lawyers, law students, and undergraduates—marched to the Landerer Printing House on March 15, 1848, seized the printing press and printed Petofi's "National Song." They also printed a list of national demands which had long been pressed by Kossuth in his many stirring articles.

These demands—the March laws—called for responsible government, equality before the law, universal taxation, popular representation, abolition of serfdom, and union with Transylvania. In April 1848, the Austrian emperor acceded to these demands.

Unfortunately, the coalition of political factions which had united on the March laws fell apart almost immediately. The diverse nationality groups in Hungary pressed for their own narrow goals or reverted to conservatism.

In September of 1848, Hungary was invaded by the Austrian Army. Kossuth responded by setting up a committee of national defense and the Hungarian Parliament declared Hungary an inde-

pendent state. Kossuth was declared Governor.

Unfortunately, however, the Hungarian victory was short lived. The Austrian emperor called upon Czar Nicholas I for help. The Austrians and the Russians simultaneously invaded Hungary and crushed the Hungarian Army.

The Austrian General Haynau, called the Hyena of Brescia for his atrocities in Italy, executed the Hungarian national leader, Batthyany, and 13 of the Hungarian generals who were afterward known as the Martyrs of Arad. The poet Petofi had disappeared in battle. Kossuth escaped to Turkey and later went to England and the United States. Thousands of Hungarians fled the country.

The United States received these refugees as she did the refugees of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. The memory of the battle for liberty is still fresh on this March 15, 1968, when we pay tribute to the memory of Lajos Kossuth and his noble struggle for the freedom of his homeland.

SENATE—Friday, March 15, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rt. Rev. Zoltan Beky, bishop emeritus of the Hungarian Reformed Church in America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all nations, we stand before Thee in humble reverence as leaders, chosen representatives, and lawmakers of this great Nation.

We invoke Thy gracious blessing upon this great assembly.

O Lord, as we give Thee thanks for our liberties, privileges, and richness, we remember those in our prayer who live under tyranny.

Today especially we remember the heroic people of Hungary, that small yet freedom-loving and brave nation, which defended the frontiers of Western civilization and the Christian faith for thousands of years and rendered many sacrifices for the freedom and peace of others.

Since it is the day of freedom in their history, we pray for Thy deliverance and Thy help, that the true day of lasting freedom may come to this nation which is now subjugated by its oppressors and the forces of evil.

We pray for the President of the United States, for all in government, and for this greatest legislative body of our world, the U.S. Senate.

Give us faith in these most difficult and challenging times of our history.

Grant us wisdom to see Thy will, courage to act on our true convictions, and bless our work in the name of our blessed Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 14, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO CORRECT SENATE RESOLUTION 265

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 265, which was passed by the Senate yesterday, contains a clerical error. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized, in the engrossment of the resolution, to correct the public law number on line 6 from "307" to "304."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider

the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The bill clerk read the nomination of H. Gardner Ackley, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to Italy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—AIR FORCE, ARMY, AND MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, and the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and I be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes at this time, rather than 6 minutes, for the purpose of reporting a resolution and making a brief comment thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 266—RESOLUTION REPORTED RELATING TO STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I report, on behalf of myself and the other members of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct—Senators BENNETT, MONRONEY, MCCARTHY, COOPER, and PEARSON—a resolution. We report the resolution favorably—in fact, unanimously.

Mr. President, this is a resolution, the reporting of which makes it official, and to which the Senate already has given its unanimous consent. It will be taken up as a special order on Monday next, immediately following the transaction of routine morning business. As I understand from the Chair, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, it will go to the calendar under unanimous-consent agreement and be proper for consideration next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, I am reporting for the committee a resolution accompanied by a report on standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the

Senate. The reporting of these recommendations at this time is simply to allow Senators and others to familiarize themselves with the committee's proposals.

The resolution presents standards of conduct in the form of proposed additions to the standing rules of the Senate. On the desk of each Senator is a report on this resolution. At various appropriate places the report quotes the resolution in full. Although these standards have been referred to as a code of ethics, it should be clear that what we are proposing here is a balanced package of standards applying to those areas of conduct that your committee considered to be the most troublesome and the most timely for action by the Senate. We have not exhausted the field on senatorial ethics, but we have made an important beginning. As the opening language of the resolution states:

These rules, as the written expression of certain standards of conduct, complement the body of unwritten but generally accepted standards that continue to apply to the Senate.

Our proposed rules, then, would fill a void from the past and provide an adequate program for meeting the needs in the areas which they address.

The areas covered by the proposed rules are outside employment; contributions; political fund activity by officers and employees; and disclosure of financial interests. Although the rules appear to weigh heavily on the conduct of employees, in reality the standards make greater demands on Senators. In our opinion, these restrictions are necessary to close the door against the kinds of operations conducted by former employees.

In another area, the recommendations would require that all official, quasi-official, political, and quasi-political funds be recorded, accounted for, and publicly disclosed. Testimonial proceeds and contributions are included in these funds.

For the first time, the murky area of funds that meander among political campaign, office expense, and personal purposes is clearly defined and strictly regulated. Not only will the public have full information of the source, amounts, and disposition of such funds, but Senators and others will be provided with a relatively simple formula governing the acceptance and use of the funds.

In developing a workable rule of personal financial disclosure, we sought to achieve a reasonable balance between respecting the privacy of the individual and compelling a wholesale disclosure of all private financial interests. In general, the rule requires the public filing of interests which may be attributable to Senate office, and the confidential filing of purely personal financial information. The confidential report would include, among other information, a copy of the Federal income tax return. All Senators and higher paid employees would have to comply with the disclosure provisions.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that point. As a general rule, all funds connected with political affairs or quasi-political affairs, or public or quasi-public affairs, would have to be publicly disclosed and accounted for under the limited rule. Those funds of a personal

nature would have to be disclosed to the Senate, but not as a public disclosure. Included in the disclosure which is not public would be a copy of the income tax return of Senators and certain employees.

Mr. President, I wish to say with emphasis here that the requirement for filing a copy of the Federal income tax return is not as great a departure from the usual practice as it might seem to be at first view, for a tax return would add little to the information that is available to the committee already, inasmuch as the committee already has been authorized to examine tax returns in the course of any inquiry. The filing of these returns, however, would facilitate the committee's business and would have other benefits for the Senate.

I cover that expressly in this brief statement because of the importance to the individual of the filing of the copy of the income tax return, and the importance of it in this plan of limited disclosure.

The income tax return would be filed under seal. It would not be open to the committee or the staff until there was an express order of a majority of the committee, entered on the minutes of the committee, as to that particular return. Then, the report could be examined only by the committee, but not used until the person involved has been given notice thereof and a chance to appear in closed session before the committee. At that time he would be able to make any points that he might wish to make or ask any questions about any matter that had arisen. It could not be used publicly until a majority of the committee has expressly voted to do so, with respect to the particular person's case for the matter pending.

Our recommendations incorporate several safeguards against abuse of tax return information. First, each sealed individual tax return may be opened only after examination is ordered by a recorded vote of the majority of the committee. Second, information from a tax return may be received as evidence by the committee only after giving notice to the individual and holding a hearing in executive session in the presence of the person involved, and he would have the right to have witnesses.

By these standards, the committee thinks that the rights of an individual whose returns are examined will be effectively protected, while at the same time, needed information will be made readily available. The restrictions placed on the handling of the returns are greater than restrictions we are under now in the handling of tax returns.

This is no hastily devised set of rules. No member of the committee yielded to any outside influence in presenting his own views during the many committee discussions that led to these proposals. On the contrary, the resolution represents the composite views of the entire membership.

Mr. President, this is a unanimous report by our six members, with the proviso that the Senator from Kentucky would go further than these proposals go with respect to the matter of public disclosure.

There is no penalty expressly written on the face of these proposed rules. Nevertheless, a severe penalty will be involved in any willful violation of the rules. Such violation can and doubtless will be considered for reprimand, censure, or expulsion of the Member, if the committee goes that far, or eligibility for employment in the case of a staff member.

Mr. President, with respect to possible loopholes, if one were to put a critical enough microscope on this matter it might be possible to find some things that could be loosely, and perhaps by the unfriendly, called loopholes.

It should be remembered that this is not a police code we were trying to write; this is a code of ethics. However, any willful action by a Senator in an evasion or an attempted evasion of these rules of conduct would be as much a violation of the rule as would be an actual violation. We are considering a code of ethics, and not a criminal code under which criminal intent is necessary to constitute a violation.

I wish to point that out with emphasis. We did not try to write a criminal code that would be appropriate in a police court. We are not dealing with that kind of code, but any willful violation of these rules or any attempt to evade their spirit in an ethical situation would be as grave an offense as an actual violation.

(At this point, Mr. McINTYRE assumed the chair.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator. I do wish to yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] also.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as I understand the suggestion of the committee, each Senator would file a copy of his income tax return with the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, a copy. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The copy that would be filed would be in a sealed envelop and it would be opened by the committee only in the event that the committee had some reason to feel that they should look at it.

Mr. STENNIS. Some real reason, and it would take the vote of four of the six members. Then, after looking at the copy of the return, it could not be used until the Member in question had been called in and given a chance to explain anything that was under consideration and even bring in witnesses, if he wished to do so, on any point.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator well knows that every American citizen is entitled to the confidentiality of his income tax return.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Sometimes we look into the returns. The Committee on Finance, for instance has authority to look at someone's income tax return, but we do not do it unless we have some reason under which we think we need to know what is in that return.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; and it has to be prima facie, based on credible evidence and not merely on suspicion. That has to be done by the controlling recorded vote

of at least four of the six members. Then, the return can be gone into.

I think the filing of that copy, along with some other things we propose to require to be filed, such as legal fees over a certain amount, is enough disclosure, of the items that are that private. I think the income tax return is a fair substitute for all the clamor about public disclosure and the like.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I applaud the Senator's committee for its conclusion in that regard. Senators do not cease to have rights of privacy, the same as all other American citizens, merely because they seek a position in the Senate, although I think it is fair that anyone who might be suspected of some wrongdoing for probable cause should be willing to make his income tax return available. What the Senator has suggested does bypass the kind of small peanut politics that some people get engaged in, sometimes, arguing about one man's financial stature which ordinarily should be irrelevant to a campaign for election.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise to support the chairman of the committee in the presentation of the report. More detailed and exhaustive discussion of its provisions and the reasons therefor will follow when the Senate considers it on Monday next.

I just want to underscore the fact that the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has no numerical majority or minority on it, although of course they are members of the majority and minority party. There are three members of each party on the committee, which provides for a unique pattern and makes it possible for members to work in an atmosphere of complete absence of partisanship.

I want to tell the Senate that that is the way in which the report and recommendations were worked out.

All members have realized that they could not write what anyone could call a complete code of ethics because men, since the beginning of the keeping of records, at least, have been trying to do that. No one has been able to write a code which could be called final.

I am thinking of the law of Moses in the Old Testament. Men are still writing books trying to interpret the meaning of some of those statements.

But the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct was charged with the responsibility of writing a code of ethics and has brought in four recommendations going to four particular problems which have been of concern to the Senate.

I am very glad that they are being presented, not as a report with no roots, but for consideration and adoption as additional Senate rules which will then put behind them all the power and dignity of the Senate itself to decide on the conduct of its own Members.

Naturally, I feel that the committee has done a good job in making this beginning, and I assure all Senators that with one exception, as noted by the chairman here, the feeling of our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]

that the committee did not go far enough in one respect, it represents what I hope will be an acceptable basis for judging the conduct of Senators and employees of the Senate in the areas covered by the rules.

I hope that all Senators will study the report over the weekend, so that when we come back on Monday to begin its discussion, we can move with speed, because I believe that the report is very clear in itself and I hope that the Senate will approve the actions of the committee.

As a member of the committee, I am prepared to stand with the chairman and do the best I can to defend it, should it come under criticism or attack.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the comments made by our chairman, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], both of whom did such a marvelous piece of work in the give and take and the necessary compromises inherent always when a group of men seek to bring issues to the Senate which are continually subject to the compromise and good judgment of its Members.

I rise to associate myself with the comments previously made and say to the distinguished chairman, and to the Senate, that it will be necessary for me to be absent on Monday next to attend the Alf Landon lectures at the University of Kansas, along with the distinguished Senator from New York; but I shall be back and look forward to participating in the continuing efforts to make the Senate a body of men respected and held in esteem by all the American people, and an instrument of good government.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his comments. He has made a real contribution to this report.

The Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has a very valuable staff who worked on all these matters a great deal. But I want to tell the Senate that the report was not written by the staff alone but was put together by painstaking work on the part of the full membership of the committee, based on our experience as Senators, and based on a great deal of information and comments that we received from Senators in response to letters we sent to all of them.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the chairman, is there any resolution on this?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. The resolution has already been introduced and it is contained in the body of the report.

Mr. AIKEN. When is it anticipated to be brought up?

Mr. STENNIS. On Monday next. We already have a special order to discuss this matter on Monday next.

Mr. AIKEN. This pamphlet explains it fully, does it?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. That is an explanation of the resolution proposing additional Senate rules.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. It is all set out in the report, with a full explanation thereon.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that there is a little information on the subject on the news ticker today.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Concerning legal fees of over \$1,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. They have to be reported when they are over \$1,000, is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. They have to be reported, yes. But that report is in the category of restricted publication. The fees have to be reported to the committee each year.

Mr. AIKEN. That means, then, any legal fees over \$1,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, from any clients.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any limit on the number?

Mr. STENNIS. There is no limit on the number of clients, but it has to be accounted for.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall not ask any more questions until I have read the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. All right. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. There are a few things I want to be sure of to avoid discrimination, if that is possible. Sometimes I think it is not possible to avoid discrimination here.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I take 2 additional minutes, to request Senators to be sure to be in the Chamber on Monday next, because this is a matter of high importance. If the Senate adopts any rules of ethics, they will have an effect on all of us, of course, and will be far reaching. I would not want any Senator to support such standards until he understood them. I hope, therefore, that all Senators will be present next Monday. We shall be prepared to give a full explanation of the subject. I commend the report for close study to all Senators. I think they will find that it is very complete within the field in which it attempts to operate. I believe that full consideration of the question of providing a copy of the income tax return, and other points, will be clearly acceptable by many Senators as a fair and effective substitute for the so-called full disclosure.

Another point I should like to make is that there is nothing retroactive about any of the provisions of the report. Nothing in the past will have to be included in any report filed, or any disclosure made by any Senator. Each rule will have an effective date—that is, some reasonable time in the future, say 60 or 90 days, varying with the rule.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and the Senate, and I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, regarding the report of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, I ask unanimous consent that there also be filed with the Senate the supplemental views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] as part of the proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I point out, for the information of anyone reading the RECORD, that the contents of this report are on the first inside page. Reference is made there to the actual committee recommendations on the indented line of Roman numerals II, III, IV, and V. Each committee recommendation contains the text of each rule provided in the resolution of the committee.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 266) is as follows:

S. RES. 266

Resolved, It is declared to be the policy of the Senate that—

(a) The ideal concept of public office, expressed by the words, "A public office is a public trust," signifies that the officer has been entrusted with public power by the people; that the officer holds this power in trust to be used only for their benefit and never for the benefit of himself or of a few; and that the officer must never conduct his own affairs so as to infringe in the public interest. All official conduct of Members of the Senate should be guided by this paramount concept of public office.

(b) These rules, as the written expression of certain standards of conduct, complement the body of unwritten but generally accepted standards that continue to apply to the Senate.

SEC. 2. The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rules:

"RULE XLI

"OUTSIDE BUSINESS, FINANCIAL, OR PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY OR EMPLOYMENT BY OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES

"1. No officer or employee whose salary is paid by the Senate may engage in any business, financial, or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

"(a) the activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

"(b) he has reported in writing the activity or employment to and has received permission from the Member of the Senate or officer of the Senate charged with supervision of the officer or employee by this rule.

"2. For the purpose of this rule,

"(a) a Senator or the Vice President is the supervisor of his administrative, clerical, or other assistants;

"(b) a Senator who is the chairman of a committee is the supervisor of the professional, clerical, or other assistants to the committee;

"(c) a Senator who is a chairman of a subcommittee which has its own staff and financial authorization is the supervisor of the professional, clerical, or other assistants to the subcommittee;

"(d) the President pro tem is the supervisor of the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, and the employees of the Office of the Legislative Counsel;

"(e) the Secretary of the Senate is the supervisor of the employees of his office;

"(f) the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper is the supervisor of the employees of his office;

"(g) the majority and minority leaders and the majority and minority whips are the supervisors of the research, clerical, or other assistants assigned to their respective offices;

"(h) the majority leader is the supervisor

of the Secretary for the majority and the employees of the Office of the Secretary for the Majority; and

"(i) the minority leader is the supervisor of the Secretary for the minority and of the employees of the Office of the Secretary for the Minority.

"3. This rule shall take effect ninety days after adoption.

"RULE XLII

"CONTRIBUTIONS

"1. A Senator may accept a contribution from—

"(a) a fund-raising event organized and held in his behalf, provided:

"(1) he has expressly given his approval of the fund-raising event to the sponsors before any funds were raised; and

"(2) he receives a complete and accurate accounting of the source, amounts, and disposition of the funds raised; or

"(b) an individual or an organization, provided the Senator makes a complete and accurate accounting of the source, amount, and disposition of the funds received.

"2. The Senator may use the contribution only to—

"(a) influence his nomination for election, or his election; or

"(b) defray the reasonable expenses, incurred or contemplated, of his office;

and shall not use directly or indirectly any part of any contribution for any other purposes.

"3. All gifts in the aggregate amount or value of \$50 or more received by a Senator from any single source during a year, except a gift from his spouse, child, or parent, and except a contribution under sections 1 and 2, shall be reported under rule XLIV.

"4. This rule shall take effect ninety days after adoption.

"RULE XLIII

"POLITICAL FUND ACTIVITY BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"1. No officer or employee whose salary is paid by the Senate may receive, solicit, be the custodian of, or distribute any funds in connection with any campaign for the nomination for election, or the election of any individual to be a Member of the Senate or to any other Federal office. This prohibition does not apply to an assistant to a Senator if the assistant, with the express approval of the Senator, receives the funds solely to transmit them either to the candidate or to the treasurer of a political committee, in accordance with Federal law.

"2. This rule shall take effect thirty days after adoption.

"RULE XLIV

"DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

"1. Each Senator, and each officer or employee of the Senate who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000 a year, shall file with the Comptroller General of the United States, in a sealed envelope marked "Confidential Personal Financial Disclosure of (Name) _____," before the 15th day of May in each year, the following reports of his personal financial interests:

"(a) a copy of the returns of taxes, declarations, statements, or other documents which he, or he and his spouse jointly, made for the preceding year in compliance with the income tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; and

"(b) the amount or value and source of each fee or compensation of \$1,000 or more received by him during the preceding year from a client for legal service; and

"(c) the name and address of each business or professional corporation, firm, or enterprise in which he was an officer, director, partner, proprietor, or employee who received compensation during the preceding year; his capacity; and the period of time; and

"(d) the identity of each interest in real

or personal property having a value of \$10,000 or more which he owned at any time during the preceding year; and

"(e) the identity of each trust or other fiduciary relation in which he held a beneficial interest having a value of \$10,000 or more, and the identity if known of each interest of the trust or other fiduciary relation in real or personal property in which the Senator, officer, or employee held a beneficial interest having a value of \$10,000 or more, at any time during the preceding year. If he cannot obtain the identity of the fiduciary interests, the Senator, officer, or employee shall request the fiduciary to report that information to the Comptroller General in the same manner that reports are filed under this rule; and

"(f) the identity of each liability of \$5,000 or more owed by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, at any time during the preceding year.

"(g) the source and value of each gift received by him during the preceding year and required to be reported by Rule XLII.

"2. All papers filed under section 1 of this rule shall be kept by the Comptroller General for not less than seven years, shall be confidential, and shall be made available only to persons authorized by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct for examination and audit for any purpose within the jurisdiction of the committee, under a resolution by a recorded majority vote of the full committee on the reports of each individual. The committee may receive the papers as evidence, after giving to the individual concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing. The Comptroller General shall report to the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct not later than the 1st day of June in each year the names of Senators, officers, and employees who have filed a report.

"3. Each Senator, and each officer or employee of the Senate who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000 a year, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate, before the 15th day of May in each year, the following reports of his personal financial interests:

"(a) the accounting required by Rule XLII for all contributions received by him during the preceding year, except that contributions in the aggregate amount or value of less than \$50 received from any single source during the reporting period may be totaled without further itemization; and

"(b) the amount or value and source of each honorarium of \$300 or more received by him during the preceding year.

"4. All papers filed under section 3 of this rule shall be kept by the Secretary of the Senate for not less than three years and shall be made available promptly for public inspection and copying.

"5. This rule shall take effect on July 1, 1968. No reports filed under section 1 or section 3 shall include any interest held, payment received, or liability owed before the effective date of the rule, before office or employment was held with the Senate, or during a period of office or employment with the Senate of less than ninety days in a year; except that the Senator, or officer or employee of the Senate, may file a copy of the return of taxes for the year 1968, or a report of substantially equivalent information for only the effective part of the year 1968."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

OXIV—421—Part 5

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OVERLOOKED LESSONS FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to some largely overlooked lessons to be drawn from the New Hampshire primary. I am honored that the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] is in the chair; and he may remain happily seated in the chair, because I am not going to comment on any of his activities in that campaign.

Based on an analysis of the vote, I am convinced that the election was a referendum on national leadership rather than on the Vietnam war. I have studied and examined the record very carefully, and although some quickly, and I believe inaccurately, attempted to oversimplify the meaning of the vote in terms of either antiwar or prowar attitudes in New Hampshire, the facts, I believe, do not bear this out, when one examines the complete record of what happened in both primaries on the basis of the latest and almost complete reports.

No, I cannot accept, Mr. President, the fact that the war in Vietnam itself was what was being evaluated by that vote. I believe it was rather the confidence average Americans have in present and prospective national leaders and their ability to handle the many problems facing our country—including, of course, but definitely not limited to, who can best win the war in Vietnam and bring it to an honorable conclusion.

This conclusion is borne out by a poll of Democratic voters taken in New Hampshire before the presidential primary. It showed that more than half those interviewed did not know where Senator McCARTHY stood on the Vietnam war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes are up.

Mr. MUNDT. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe it is significant that according to the New York Times article:

The poll also indicated that the more the voters knew the Minnesota Democrat was a dove on the war, the less likely they were to vote for him. Senator McCarthy received about 42% of the primary vote and according to an analysis of the earlier survey, many of these votes came from people who were hawks on the war.

But let us examine the vote totals themselves to see what they actually do show. In the Democratic primary, President Johnson received 26,337 votes or 48.5 percent. Our colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], received 22,810 or 42 percent. Senator McCARTHY was labeled a "peace candidate," a label which to a certain extent I be-

lieve was unfair to Senator McCARTHY because he is a knowledgeable Senator, well versed on all issues, domestic and foreign. He serves on the Committee on Foreign Relations and carefully examines both domestic and foreign issues. I am told he campaigned on many other issues besides the war in Vietnam. Still, many political kibitzers would rather overlook his well-rounded campaign and claim that those 42 percent of the Democrats voted "against the war."

But what about the other side? In the Republican primary there was Harold Stassen, an avowed "peace" candidate; in fact, that was his entire campaign theme. How did that "test of sentiment" on the war in Vietnam turn out? He received 407 votes, or 0.4 percent.

Does that mean that less than 1 percent of the Republicans are "against the war"? Of course not. They want peace as much as those who voted in the Democratic primary, but they believe it will take new leadership to achieve it, and they voted overwhelmingly for the man they believe can produce it—Richard Nixon.

The former Vice President received 84,005 votes or 79 percent, and he did not counsel retreat. He did not say we should pull out of Vietnam. He said he believes in peace with honor, and evidently the people of New Hampshire do also. He has said new leadership in the White House—Republican leadership—would be an important, constructive step toward peace. New leadership, Nixon has said, would not be handicapped by commitments to tactics and policies which have thus far failed. New leadership would also bring new advisers into consultation on the conduct of the war and on the paths to an enduring peace.

Let us look at it another way. Accepting for the purpose of argumentation only that those who voted for or against a particular candidate were voting only on the basis that they were for or against the war, what do the current totals show us? Nixon with his 84,005 votes and President Johnson with his 26,337 votes would, I assume, be lumped broadly into the same "for the war" category. This is a total of 110,342 votes by New Hampshire citizens who thought the war should be pressed on, and that we should not pull out.

Only two other candidates in either primary received over 1,000 votes; and so, simply because the unknown candidates' totals would have little effect on the overall percentage, we can eliminate them. The two candidates who did receive more than 1,000 votes were Governor Rockefeller and Governor Romney. Governor Rockefeller's views on the war are not known, so in all fairness his vote total should not be counted in either camp, as we make this analysis of the results of the votes in New Hampshire, vis-a-vis whether or not we should accept defeat in Vietnam and pull out, or whether we should press on, in expectation that the enemy in the end will recognize our superior strength and come to the negotiating table for a civilized settlement of the war.

Governor Romney and his 1,753 votes

will be assigned to the "against the war" category, with Senator McCARTHY's 22,810 and Harold Stassen's previously mentioned 407. This gives us a grand total of 24,970 "against the war" votes.

Based on these vote totals, therefore—which is the realistic and honest way to approach the issue—the "for the war" vote of 110,342 represents around 81 percent as opposed to the 19 percent that are "against the war." Thus it is much more logical to conclude that the New Hampshire vote was a 4-to-1 majority rejecting a pullout from Vietnam under prevailing conditions, than to try to twist its meaning into a manifestation that the doves have taken over New Hampshire.

Clearly this does not sound as though the people of New Hampshire repudiated our involvement in Vietnam. In fact the exact contrary is the truth as expressed by the ballots for all to see.

No, Mr. President, as I pointed out earlier, this was a vote on leadership, on confidence, and above all the ability to meet and solve the multitude of problems facing a beleaguered nation, including, of course, the problem of the Vietnam war.

New Hampshire is a rural State and its farmers and smalltown citizens are aware, I am sure, as are the farmers and smalltown people of South Dakota and all other rural States, of the problems facing agriculture with its disastrous 74 percent parity price levels, and they question the ability of the present administration to solve them.

New Hampshire is also familiar with the problems of the large cities, including the increase in crime and riots, and they question the ability of the present administration to solve them.

New Hampshire residents are aware of the inflationary forces at work in our economy, and they question the ability of the present administration to control them.

New Hampshire residents pay taxes, and they sense that the present administration may raise them only to squander the extra revenues which are raised.

New Hampshire residents have observed our failure as a world leader and they question whether the present administration can reverse this trend.

These factors are reflected in the great and unexpected McCarthy vote, not just the war. And these factors were reflected in the Republican primary also and the voters expressed their confidence in Dick Nixon and his ability to handle not only the war, but also the problems of agriculture, the cities, inflation, taxes, and our failures in world leadership. His total of 79 percent of the Republican vote in a field of eight or nine candidates clearly indicates that the Republican Party need look no further to find a winner, if it is a winner we want next November.

Incidentally, in a sense President Johnson did very well in view of the great wave of national uncertainty and discontent in this country since 26,337 New Hampshire voters did make the effort required to write in his name since it was not on the ballot. This compares rather well when contrasted with the fact only 7,670 New Hampshire voters made the effort to write in the name of Rockefeller

since his name also was not on the ballot. Either this proves that Nixon is a runaway favorite over Governor Rockefeller in New Hampshire, or that an astonishing smaller percentage of Republican voters in New Hampshire know how to read or write compared with their Democratic associates—and I would hate to admit that—or that President Johnson really did not do so badly after all since during the last 10 days of the New Hampshire primary, great and expensive efforts were made to induce Republican voters to write in the name of Rockefeller including, we now learn, over 250,000 postcards sent to New Hampshire voters by a well-organized Rockefeller-for-President committee headed by former Governor Hugh Gregg of that State, an able, active, and capable "old pro" in politics. It is obvious from the history of the State that inexperienced politicians do not win elections in New Hampshire and Governor Gregg is no inexperienced amateur in organizing political campaigns. But above all, the New Hampshire election proves that you do not have to favor defeat in Vietnam in order to come up with victory in a New Hampshire election as demonstrated by the 4-to-1 majority on the part of all voters given to all candidates rejecting failure in Vietnam as a campaign battle cry. Perhaps it only proves that with the presence of Dick Nixon in the race and his astonishingly high vote, we now have among the contestants for President an eagle as well as a dove and a hawk.

That, Mr. President, is the story of the New Hampshire election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article to which I referred be printed in the RECORD at this place together with comments, contained in a frontline election report in the New York Times written from Concord, N.H., on March 13.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, MARCH 15, 1968

A poll of Democratic voters in New Hampshire before the Presidential primary Tuesday showed that more than half those interviewed did not know where Senator Eugene J. McCarthy stood on the Vietnam war.

The poll also indicated that the more the voters knew the Minnesota Democrat was a dove on the war, the less likely they were to vote for him.

Senator McCarthy received about 42 percent of the primary vote and according to an analysis of the earlier survey, many of these votes came from people who were hawks on the war.

The sampling of Democratic primary voters was conducted throughout New Hampshire on February 23 and 24 when 300 voters were interviewed by Oliver Quayle and Co., Inc., a public opinion survey company in Bronxville, New York. The survey was made for the National Broadcasting Co.

Both NBC and the survey company concluded that the Democratic vote in New Hampshire was a vote of dissatisfaction with the Vietnam war but not a vote for a dovish stand.

NBC said it believed the heavy vote for Senator McCarthy was not a vote against President Johnson's Vietnam policy but against Mr. Johnson himself.

The President received about 48 percent of the vote in a write-in campaign.

ARTICLE BY TOM WICKER, NEW YORK TIMES, MARCH 13, 1968

CONCORD, N.H.—An excellent showing in the New Hampshire Republican primary today by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon probably had the effect of pushing Governor Rockefeller of New York toward entry into the Oregon primary. Another excellent vote-getting performance, by Senator Eugene J. McCarthy of Minnesota in this state's Democratic primary, left Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York more than ever on the horns of a political dilemma.

Mr. Nixon smashed, by about 80 per cent to 10 per cent, a write-in campaign waged on behalf of, but without the official blessing of, Governor Rockefeller.

Mr. Rockefeller can and will disavow the write-in effort as unauthorized. But the fact will remain that incomplete but fairly conclusive returns showed him winning less than half of the 19,504 votes he got in a full-scale campaign here in 1964.

The Governor's total tonight was also far less than the 15,000 votes the write-in campaign's principal sponsors said they had hoped for.

More importantly, the Rockefeller write-in lagged far behind the 15,587 write-in votes cast here in 1964 for Richard M. Nixon. The Nixon write-in of that year was unauthorized, as was the campaign waged for Mr. Rockefeller this year.

Thus, the total for Mr. Rockefeller today, even though he made no effort to increase it, contributed little if any to the "draft" he has said he is awaiting.

Without the development of something resembling such a draft, most political observers believe the New York Governor will be forced into the Oregon primary, where he can do battle openly with Mr. Nixon and possibly Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

As for Senator Kennedy, neither as a write-in possibility for President nor in an unofficial write-in contest between him and Vice President Humphrey, did he show any surprise vote-getting power.

Mr. McCarthy's strong showing against President Johnson, however, demonstrated that there is a strong potential in the antiwar movement, and in opposition to President Johnson.

Most Democrats and political analysts believe Senator Kennedy would have been an even stronger candidate against Mr. Johnson than Mr. McCarthy who was not well known nationally when he decided to make the race.

Recent polls taken there show him running well ahead of both the President and Mr. McCarthy.

On the other hand, Mr. Kennedy would only split the antiwar, anti-Johnson vote if he and Mr. McCarthy both ran in California. Mr. Kennedy has no way to force Mr. McCarthy to withdraw, and since the latter was willing to make the race when it looked hopeless, even an effort to push him aside now would win Mr. Kennedy few friends.

Thus, while the potential of an insurgent candidacy was dramatically demonstrated in New Hampshire, the man most Democrats consider the real alternative to President Johnson appears less able than ever to take advantage of this position.

PRUDENT ACTION BY SENATE IN APPROVING REMOVAL OF THE GOLD RESERVE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senate took wise and prudent action last night when it approved the proposal to remove the gold reserve from our currency. Such action was imperative if the international monetary system was to continue in an orderly way to serve international trade and commerce.

Speculation in the markets had clearly

gotten out of hand in recent days, and most of the world gold markets including the major one in London were obviously closed because of the disorderly conditions that were prevailing.

Today the Treasury Department announced that the United States has "invited the central bank governors of the active gold pool countries to consult with us on coordinated measures to insure orderly conditions in the exchange markets and to support the present pattern of exchange rates based on the fixed price of \$35 per ounce of gold." The meeting will take place this weekend in Washington and negotiations will be undertaken to establish a unified front by the gold policy countries. It was vital that the gold cover removal be passed so that our Government could enter into these negotiations with maximum leverage. I believe that the negotiations will be fruitful ones and that the gold policy countries who have cooperated so well in the past will continue to do so in the future to protect the stability of the market.

I am told that today world exchange markets have reacted well and calmly and in an orderly fashion. There is reason for optimism, Mr. President, and I am confident that we shall be able to head off this rush upon the dollar and that in the final analysis it will be the speculators who suffer the greatest injury.

We have taken the first step, Mr. President, and I am already encouraged with the results.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, concerning the meeting this weekend be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Treasury Department and Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D.C., Mar. 14, 1968]

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AND THE HONORABLE WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

The temporary closing of the London market does not affect the United States undertaking to buy and sell gold in transactions with monetary authorities at the official price of \$35 per ounce.

We have invited the central bank governors of the active gold pool countries to consult with us on coordinated measures to ensure orderly conditions in the exchange markets and to support the present pattern of exchange rates based on the fixed price of \$35 per ounce of gold.

The central bank governors invited are: Hubert Ansiaux, Governor, Banque Nationale de Belgique, Belgium; Dr. Karl Blessing, President, Deutsche Bundesbank, Germany; Guido Carli, Governor, Banca d'Italia, Italy; Prof. J. Zijlstra, President, De Nederlandsche Bank, Netherlands; Dr. E. Stopper, President, Banque National Suisse, Switzerland, and Sir Leslie Kenneth O'Brien, Governor, Bank of England, United Kingdom.

CORRECTION OF AN ERROR IN A UPI REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in looking at the ticker, I note what appears to be a slight error in quoting what I said prior to the session today.

I am quoted in the UPI wire dispatch as saying I felt that, given time and if not pressed too hard about the matter, the House would probably pass a tax bill that would bring in substantial revenue. The quotation referred to a surtax. I have my doubts that the House will pass the surtax bill or a surtax bill at all.

If I were engaged in a guessing game, I would think that the House would be more likely to draft its own revenue bill and simply provide for a change in rates in the areas in which they thought a change in rates would be appropriate, rather than to vote for an additional tax on top of a tax. As a surtax proposal would operate, it makes very little difference from the point of revenue, but the procedure by which one would assess it is certainly different as between a surtax approach and a simple change of rates.

I do not have any different opinion now than I had when I told certain reporters that I felt the House would pass a substantial tax increase, if given time and not pressed too hard by the Senate or anyone else about the matter. That slight difference in the story on the wire, however, might cause one to think that I thought they would buy the proposal exactly as suggested by the administration.

I merely feel that the House probably would pass a bill to raise substantially more revenue in either corporate or individual income taxes, or in both.

I merely wanted to correct the RECORD on that point.

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY ELECTION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to state my reaction and some of my thoughts concerning the New Hampshire election which was alluded to today by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

It would seem to me that the press has not yet conveyed the fact that President Johnson received more votes than did Senator McCARTHY.

I am fond of both men. It has been my good fortune to serve with both. I have the highest regard for both men. However, my impression of elections was that the man who got the highest number of votes was the man who won. And all of the accounts reporting that Senator McCARTHY won seem to ignore the fact that President Johnson was not on the ballot. Yet, he received more votes than did Senator McCARTHY. I believe the President got 48.5 percent of the votes and Senator McCARTHY got only 42 percent.

I would wonder whether the same press sources would have reported the story in the same way if Governor Wallace had been a candidate and received 42 percent of the votes in a like situation. My guess is that they would have reported that Governor Wallace's name was the only name on the ballot and that President Johnson was not an avowed candidate and did not campaign in the State, but that his name was written in upon the ballots and that President Johnson finished ahead by a convincing margin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Upon that basis, my thought is that some of the same newspapers, particularly those in the East, which have not been too friendly to former Governor Wallace, would have reported that he had suffered another defeat. But with regard to a situation where President Johnson appears to be the candidate, the press rushed to draw the conclusion that President Johnson had theoretically been defeated, when, as a practical matter, my understanding of politics is that when you get a majority to vote for you, you win.

The first time I was elected, I received slightly more than 50 percent of the votes, and that margin made all the difference. It made the difference between coming to the Senate and taking the oath of office and staying home in Louisiana while the other man would have come to the Senate and took the oath of office.

I know that Lyndon Johnson was running for the office of Senator from Texas about the same time, and I believe he won by less than 100 votes. That made the difference between one man coming to the well of the Senate and taking the oath of office as Senator from Texas, and the other man staying in Texas and devoting his time and attention to something other than public affairs.

In view of the fact that President Johnson was not on the ballot and he received a plurality of the votes in his party, from what little I know about politics, I would have to say that he won. But even though the situation is such that because there were twice as many candidates for delegate on the ballot favoring President Johnson as there were favoring his opponent, the vote was so badly split among the Johnson supporters that they elected only a couple of delegates, which would indicate that President Johnson, again, was not seeking delegates, the same as he would have done if he had regarded this as a life-or-death matter and needed those delegates in order to be nominated.

In my judgment, regardless of the result of that primary or any other primary, President Johnson will be the nominee, even though I do not have a moment's quarrel with Senator McCARTHY's decision to run.

I have learned that campaigning seems to be good for people. They meet a lot of nice folks, get a lot of fresh air, get good exercise, and make friends. Campaigning has always expanded my chest, because I tend to breathe more deeply. Breathing deeply in good outdoor areas tends to expand the chest and improve the health generally.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

A letter from the Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant

to law, a report that proceedings under the act have been finally concluded with respect to the following claim: Docket No. 193, *the Kickapoo Tribe of Kansas, the Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma, the Kickapoo Nation et al., Petitioners, v. the United States of America, Defendant* (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report that proceedings under the act have been finally concluded with respect to the following claim: Docket No. 166, *the Creek Nation, Plaintiff, v. the United States of America, Defendant*; the petition was dismissed February 13, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF PROPOSED MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Naval Reserve (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EVALUATION REPORT, WATER RESOURCES APPRAISAL FOR HYDROELECTRIC LICENSING

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting an evaluation report of the views of the Federal Power Commission relative to Federal acquisition of the Mystic Lake hydroelectric project (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Commerce.

ECONOMIC REPORT ON INSTALLMENT CREDIT AND RETAIL SALES PRACTICES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RETAILERS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting an economic report on installment credit and retail sales practices of District of Columbia retailers, dated March 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED INCREASE OF COMPENSATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 so as to increase the compensation of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Assistant to the Commissioner, and the members of the District of Columbia Council (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposition of unclaimed property in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of female employees in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of

the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors in the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low- and moderate-income persons and families in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require permits for the possession of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, Executive Office, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit landlords from retaliating against tenants for good-faith complaints of housing violations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of actions taken to improve the Government's method for evaluating vehicle use and for estimating vehicle needs, General Services Administration, dated March 12, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the need to increase effectiveness of the neighborhood youth corps program for aiding students and unemployed youth in Cleveland (Ohio) Department of Labor (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1967, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated March 12, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

LOAN APPLICATION FROM CAMERON COUNTY WATER CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 4 OF SANTA MARIA, TEX.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, information on the receipt of project proposals; an application for a loan in the amount of \$727,000 from the Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 4, Santa Maria, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED NATIONAL MEMORIAL TO WOODROW WILSON IN THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a National Memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the Smithsonian Institution (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:
Resolutions of the General Court of the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION REMOVING THE RESTRICTION ON THE AMOUNT OF INCOME A PERSON MAY EARN WHILE RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS"

"Whereas, Under present law persons receiving social security benefits are not permitted to earn more than sixteen hundred and eighty dollars in any one year without a decrease in payments received by them; and

"Whereas, Many of the persons receiving such payments are almost totally dependent upon them for their living expenses; and

"Whereas, The cost of living has increased substantially so that the benefits referred to are now totally inadequate; and

"Whereas, The removal of the restriction on the amount of income that a person may earn while receiving social security benefits will enable such persons to retain their self respect; now, therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation removing the restrictions on the amount of income a person may earn while receiving social security benefits; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 28, 1968.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,

"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, March 4, 1968.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,

"Clerk.

"Attest:

"JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF ALL MEDICAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM"

"Whereas, Under the present Medicare program members must pay part of the medical expenses they incur; and

"Whereas, The Medicare program has certain limitations as to the amount of time said members are covered by the program; and

"Whereas, The Medicare program fails to provide benefits for many of the medical expenses of the members; and

"Whereas, Many of the members are unable to pay the medical expenses they incur that are not covered by the Medicare program; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for the payment by the government of all medical expenses incurred by members of the Medicare program; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 28, 1968.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,

"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, March 4, 1968.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,

"Clerk.

"Attest:

"JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO INCLUDE A COST OF LIVING INDEX FORMULA IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT PAYMENTS"

"Whereas, Under the present regulations those persons receiving social security benefits are limited to a fixed income; and

"Whereas, Many of the persons receiving such payments are almost totally dependent upon them for their living expenses; and

"Whereas, The cost of living has increased continually from year to year; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that there be a cost of living index formula included in the method of computing payments under the social security law; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 28, 1968.

"NORMAN L. PIDGEON,

"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, March 4, 1968.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,

"Clerk.

"Attest:

"JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 202

"Whereas, the President of the United States established the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice to study the causes of crime in the nation and to make recommendations on ways to combat crime and this 19-member Commission, supported by a staff of 63 and with the services of 175 consultants, did prepare and deliver its report to the President in early 1967; and

"Whereas, the Commission recommended to the President as one of more than 200 specific recommendations that 'enforcement officials should provide regular briefings to leaders at all levels of government concerning organized crime conditions within the jurisdiction' and concluded its report by stating: '(America) must recognize that the government of a free society is obliged to act not only effectively but fairly. It (America) must seek knowledge and admit mistakes'; and

"Whereas, the Commission employed one Professor G. Robert Blakey, a member of the Notre Dame Law School faculty and a national authority on organized crime activities, who, in the course of his work as a consultant to the Commission, prepared a 63-page document or supplement, referred to in the press as the 'Blakey Report', which purportedly treats in detail various unwholesome links between Mafia gangsters and Cook County political figures, judges and law enforcement personnel, and additionally, is reported to cite corrupt influences in the Illinois General Assembly;

"Whereas, numerous press dispatches have said the 'Blakey Report' has been deliberately suppressed because of possible embarrassment to those officeholders, judges, political figures and legislators, so that honest officeholders and the public in general remain uninformed about the nature of the alleged corruption or the identity of those so charged, creating a haunting cloud of suspicion which besmirches the entire governmental structure of the State of Illinois, and particularly Cook County; and

"Whereas, since the President's Commis-

sion has now been disbanded with submission of its report to the President of the United States, the only remedy for restoration of the good name of government in the State of Illinois and in Cook County and for the apprehension and punishment of the perpetrators of any criminal acts detailed in the 'Blakey Report' is the immediate release of that material either directly by the President or through the Attorney General of the United States; therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the Seventy-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that:

"1. The President of the United States be urged to release that 'Blakey Report' to the Executive Committee of this Senate, to the Illinois Crime Investigation Commission, to the Attorney General of Illinois or to some other body with subpoena power, for appropriate action;

"2. If the President should continue to suppress the 'Blakey Report', he be urged to state explicitly whether he is following the policy recommended by his Commission which states, 'Reports should be withheld from jurisdictions where corruption is apparent and knowledge by a corrupt official of the information in the report could compromise enforcement efforts', or, on the other hand, whether he continues to suppress the 'Blakey Report' because of possible embarrassment to present officeholders; and

"3. A copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the minority leader of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives of the United States, all U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from Illinois, the Attorney General of Illinois, the Executive Director of the Illinois Crime Investigation Commission, the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, the State's Attorney of Cook County, the President and President pro-tem of the Illinois Senate, the Speaker of the Illinois House of Representatives and the chairman of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

"Adopted by the Senate, March 4, 1968.

"SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD E. FERNANDES,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the city council of the city of Mill Valley, Calif., favoring a policy of peace in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 15414. A bill to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations (Rept. No. 1014).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3171. A bill making the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3172. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Alfonso Hernandez Canizares; and

S. 3173. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joaquin Francisco Palmerola Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 3174. A bill to establish a national memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3175. A bill for the relief of Yu Ming Hon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 3176. A bill for the relief of Stephen K. Shao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3177. A bill for the relief of Sing Li, Kwun Li Lin, and Kwong Ho Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MONROE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 153. A joint resolution to proclaim the week beginning May 1, as "Youth Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. INOUE when he introduced the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S.J. Res. 154. A joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Transportation to provide for administrative services for the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3174—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL MEMORIAL TO WOODROW WILSON IN THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a national memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the Smithsonian Institution. I also send to the desk with the bill a statement setting forth the purpose of the bill and briefly explaining its provisions. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, the bill and the statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3174) to establish a national memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the Smithsonian Institution, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3174

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that a living institution expressing the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson would be an appropriate memorial to his accomplishments as the twenty-eighth President of the United States, a distinguished scholar, an outstanding university president, and a brilliant advocate of international understanding;

(2) that the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission, created by joint resolution of Congress, recommended that an International Center for Scholars be constructed in the District of Columbia in the area north of the proposed Market Square as part of the Nation's memorial to Woodrow Wilson;

(3) that such a center, symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relations between the world of learning and the world of public affairs, would be a suitable memorial to the spirit of Woodrow Wilson; and

(4) that the establishment of such a center would be consonant with the purposes of the Smithsonian Institution, created by Congress in 1846 "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

THE CENTER AND THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Smithsonian Institution a Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and a Board of Trustees of the Center (hereinafter referred to as the "Center" and the "Board"), whose duties it shall be to maintain and administer the Center and site thereof and to execute such other functions as are vested in the Board by this Act.

(b) The Board of Trustees shall be composed of fifteen members as follows:

- (1) The Secretary of State;
- (2) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;
- (3) The Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities;
- (4) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution;

(5) not to exceed three appointed by the President from time to time from within the Federal Government; and

(6) eight appointed by the President from private life.

(c) Each member of the Board of Trustees specified in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b) may designate another official to serve on the Board of Trustees in his stead.

(d) Each member of the Board of Trustees appointed under paragraph (6) of subsection (b) shall serve for a term of six years from the expiration of his predecessor's term; except that (1) any trustee appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of office of the trustees first taking office shall begin on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall expire as designated at the time of appointment, two at the end of two years, three at the end of four years, and three at the end of six years. No trustee of the Board chosen from private life shall be eligible to serve in excess of two consecutive terms, except that a trustee whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

(e) The President shall designate a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among the members of the Board chosen from private life.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) In administering the Center, the Board shall have all necessary and proper

powers, which shall include but not be limited to the power to:

(1) appoint scholars, from the United States and abroad, and, where appropriate, provide stipends, grants, and fellowships to such scholars, and to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Board in carrying out its responsibilities;

(2) solicit, accept, and dispose of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, securities, and other property of whatsoever character for the benefit of the Center; any such money, securities, or other property shall, upon receipt, be deposited with the Smithsonian Institution, and unless otherwise restricted by the terms of the gift, expenditures shall be in the discretion of the Board for the purposes of the Center;

(3) obtain grants from, and make contracts with, State, Federal, local, and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals;

(4) acquire such site as a location for the Center as may subsequently be authorized by the Congress;

(5) acquire, hold, maintain, use, operate, and dispose of any physical facilities, including equipment, necessary for the operation of the Center;

(6) appoint and fix the compensation and duties of the director and such other officers of the Center as may be necessary for the efficient administration of the Center; the director and two other officers of the Center may be appointed and compensated without regard to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service and chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5 of the United States Code;

(7) prepare plans and specifications for the Center including the design and development of all buildings, facilities, open spaces, and other structures on the site in consultation with appropriate Federal and local agencies; and

(8) delegate to members of the Board or the Director of the Center such of its powers and responsibilities as it deems appropriate and useful for the administration of the Center.

(b) The Board shall, in connection with acquisition of any site authorized by Congress, as provided for in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of this section, provide, to businesses and residents displaced from any such site, relocation assistance, including payments and other benefits, equivalent to that authorized to displaced businesses and residents under the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The Board shall develop a relocation program for existing businesses and residents within the site and submit such program to the Government of the District of Columbia for a determination as to its adequacy and feasibility. In providing such relocation assistance and developing such relocation program the Board shall utilize to the maximum extent the services and facilities of the appropriate Federal and local agencies.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. The Board is authorized to adopt an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and to make such bylaws, rules, and regulations, as it deems necessary for the administration of its functions under this Act, including, among other matters, bylaws, rules, and regulations relating to the administration of its trust funds and the organization and procedure of the Board. A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 7. The accounts of the Board shall be audited in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to, and as part of, the audit of the other Federal and trust funds of the Smithsonian Institution.

The statement, presented by Mr. ANDERSON, is as follows:

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL MEMORIAL TO WOODROW WILSON IN THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

This proposed legislation is the result of what Dr. Robert Goheen, President of Princeton University, has described as a "remarkable convergence of academic and cultural interests."

Since the time of President Washington, scholars, public officials, and interested citizens have dreamed of the creation in our Nation's Capital of a great international center for scholars. In 1961, the Congress established by joint resolution a Commission to recommend a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the District of Columbia.

At the hearings of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission on March 2 and 10, 1966, the proponents of a scholarly center urged the appropriateness of such a memorial to the twenty-eighth President of the United States. Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated:

"There is a need, there is a need here in Washington, for facilities for greater service to our scholars and to the understanding of national and international affairs. And we feel that the idea of a living memorial for Woodrow Wilson could be a very timely and appropriate occasion for trying to meet some of those needs which are obviously here in our Nation's Capital."

Secretary S. Dillon Ripley of the Smithsonian Institution stated:

"Because a fitting memorial to Woodrow Wilson must both respect his legacy and evoke his memory, I hope that the members of this Commission will recommend the creation of a living memorial in the form of a great international center for advanced study in our Nation's Capital."

President Robert F. Goheen of Princeton University stated:

"The idea I wish to urge upon you is of a living memorial which will embrace the public and private aspects of Woodrow Wilson's great career: his work as Statesman, and as scholar; as man of affairs and man of letters. And, specifically, I wish to propose that the living heart of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial should be a Center for scholars who need to work on the incomparable assemblage of materials here in Washington relating to the study of American history and the analysis of public and international affairs."

In September 1966, the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission submitted its final report to the President and the Congress of the United States. In this final report, the Commission recommended that an International Center for Scholars, to be located north of the National Archives building, be constructed as part of the Nation's memorial to Woodrow Wilson. The report further stated that, "The Commission is impressed with Dr. Ripley's proposal that the Center be formally associated with the Smithsonian Institution as a bureau under the guidance of its own Board of Trustees, while its own Director and administrative staff..."

On February 27, 1967, in his message on the District of Columbia, President Johnson stated that, "The proposal of the Woodrow Wilson Commission has much to commend it." In asking the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue to conduct a study to develop a detailed plan for the Center, President Johnson further stated: "It is my hope that the Center will

serve as a place for bringing together scholars and students from other countries to increase understanding among peoples of the world, as well as an important educational institution."

In January of 1968, the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue submitted its recommendations to the President, supporting the recommendation of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission that an international center for scholars be established in the area north of the National Archives building as a living memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

In his message on the District of Columbia in March of 1968, President Johnson stated: "Through an imaginative combination of public and private leadership and financing, this Center could serve as 'an institution of learning that the 22nd century will regard as having influenced the 21st.'"

"The dream of a great scholarly center in our Nation's Capital is as old as the Republic itself. There could be no more fitting monument to the memory of Woodrow Wilson than an institution devoted to the highest ideals of scholarship and international understanding."

"I recommend legislation authorizing the establishment of a Center to be operated by an independent board of trustees within the framework of the Smithsonian Institution. Trustees for the Center, in collaboration with the government of the District of Columbia and the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission, and with the approval of the National Capital Planning Commission, will work out detailed plans for the Center and for the development of Market Square."

The present legislation submitted by the Smithsonian Institution to implement the proposals of the President, will, if enacted, bring into being the living memorial that has been recommended now by a Congressional Commission, a Presidential Commission, and the President himself.

Specifically, this legislation would establish within the Smithsonian Institution a Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and a Board of Trustees of the Center for the administration thereof.

Consistent with the purpose of the Center, to symbolize and strengthen relations between the scholarly world and the world of public affairs, the Board of Trustees is to be composed in part of appropriate officials of the Government of the United States (Secretary of State, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and as many as three others), and in part of private citizens. In order to insure the independence of the Board, its private members, who will constitute a majority of the fifteen member board, will be appointed for staggered six-year terms.

The bill provides that in administering the Center the Board shall have all necessary and appropriate powers. Among these are the power to appoint a Director and staff, to award fellowships and grants, to receive and spend monies, to plan an appropriate site and buildings, and to acquire such site as may subsequently be authorized by the Congress. In connection with the acquisition of any site, the Board is instructed to make full provision for the relocation of businesses and residences in cooperation with appropriate local and Federal authorities.

This legislation, if enacted, will establish within the Smithsonian Institution the necessary mechanism for planning and creating the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Center. The Board may employ the appropriate personnel to plan both the program of the Center and its physical facilities and may proceed, when authorized by the Congress, to acquire a site for the Center.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of funds necessary for these purposes, but also empowers the Board to solicit and receive private funds for the Center.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 153— INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION PROCLAIMING WEEK BEGINNING MAY 1, AS "YOUTH WEEK"

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks boasts more than 1½ million members in more than 2,000 lodges in the United States.

These members help to raise more than \$8 million annually for charity and community betterment activities, including support of hospital and training centers for young victims of cerebral palsy, and rehabilitation programs for the blind, deaf, and mentally retarded.

Year 1968 marks the centennial anniversary of this fine organization. To commemorate this event, the order's youth activities committee has chosen to pay a special tribute to American boys and girls.

The committee designated May 1 as the beginning of Elks National Youth Week. During this week Elks lodges will award scholarships and grants to young men and women who have shown outstanding leadership and scholastic abilities.

Today I am privileged to introduce a joint resolution which proclaims the week beginning May 1 as Youth Week and urges all departments of Government, civic, fraternal, and patriotic groups, and our citizens generally to participate wholeheartedly in its observance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 153) to proclaim the week beginning May 1, as "Youth Week," introduced by Mr. INOUE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 3158) to repeal the authority for current wheat and feed grain programs, the name of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be added as a cosponsor of S. 3157, a bill to establish the Potomac National River in the States of Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia, and for other purposes, and that his name be listed as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTION

TO PROVIDE STANDARDS OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1015)

Mr. STENNIS, from the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate, and submitted a report thereon; which resolution was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under a separate heading.)

NEXT STEP—HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a subject of considerable significance in public housing for the elderly was discussed in the Journal of Housing, issue No. 2, 1968. An article written by Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, Assistant for Problems of the Elderly and the Handicapped in the Office of the Secretary for Renewal and Housing Assistance in HUD, directs attention to this question: What kind of "next step" housing for the elderly can be provided when independent living in public housing is no longer possible?

Mrs. McGuire said that the answer to this question must be found in the very near future:

Present day emphasis on independent living, with supporting services to sustain independence as long as possible, is valid. However, through age or illness, the time will come when either temporary or permanent relocation will be needed. Because this need will involve thousands of older people, in large and small communities, the problem has national implications.

Suggestions are made for a continuum plan—to include housing designed to meet the changing needs made necessary by the aging process; the wider use of congregate housing; and an examination of the possibilities of providing solutions on the basis of a housing-medical approach.

Mr. President, I commend Mrs. McGuire for this timely statement and ask unanimous consent that her article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT KIND OF "NEXT STEP" HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY CAN BE PROVIDED WHEN INDEPENDENT LIVING IN PUBLIC HOUSING IS NO LONGER POSSIBLE?

(What follows is an answer to the above question, which NAHRO recently put to Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, Assistant for Problems of the Elderly and Handicapped in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Renewal and Housing Assistance, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.)

What is to be the "next step" housing or nursing home shelter for elderly tenants when they no longer can live independently in public housing?

This question has been given considerable thought in view of the fact that thousands of units for the well elderly have been built and one day a "next step" solution will be

needed. Statistically, we know that the group with the highest potential for illness requiring medical attention is the elderly—and generally the potential increases in relation to age.

Since more and more elderly tenants who moved into public housing during the last 10 years are becoming feeble, some housing authorities face a serious situation today. A public landlord, or a private one with federal financial assistance, cannot avoid responsibility for relocation of such tenants when independent living is no longer possible. However, it is a fact that many communities simply do not have the necessary facilities within the paying ability of low-income elderly persons as a resource for the concerned housing manager.

CONTINUUM PLAN

Obviously, the best answer would be for local communities to develop a "continuum" plan of housing and facilities for the various stages in the aging process. Present-day emphasis on independent living, with supporting services to sustain independence as long as possible, is valid. However, through age or illness, the time will come when either temporary or permanent relocation will be needed. Because this need will involve thousands of older people, in large and small communities, the problem has national implications.

CONGREGATE HOUSING

One approach is the congregate type of living, with central food services and minor personal assistance (such as in bathing and dressing). In such housing, the elderly can continue to sustain a degree of self-management. Providing such housing is more desirable and less costly than relocation to medical institutions. It was this realization that prompted, in 1963, the development of the congregate concept in public housing. It has had only limited use, primarily because of the absence of any subsidy to cover possible deficits arising from the food service. The Department of Housing and Urban Development presently is exploring the feasibility of including a "personal care home" component in the Section 202 direct loan program.

The question also has been raised as to whether large houses operated by matrons could be put to use for those frail enough to need help, but not nursing care, in a good "foster home" atmosphere.

After the "personal care" stage, the next stage in the continuum is the nursing home for temporary or longtime care—hopefully, homes that provide therapy looking toward the individual's return to normal community living.

Hospitals and extended care facilities complete the continuum.

Of course, this is not to suggest that housing programs for independent living should be curtailed until relocation facilities are available. It does say that, in planning housing for the elderly, no matter in what income group, sponsors should be aware of the problems brought on by a diminishing capacity for independent living and view it as one of the realities in operation of housing for the elderly. Hopefully, then, the sponsors will activate community awareness and interest in finding solutions.

HOW, NOW?

In the meantime, the question remains of what to do about tenants who need care and assistance now. In San Antonio, a system of requiring signed statements by "sponsors" was tried by the housing authority. These "sponsors" were to be responsible for relocation when and if it became necessary. The system was so distasteful to the applicants that it was soon dropped and only the name of "next of kin" was required on the applications. Sometimes, there is no kin and, at other times, the kin on the application has died before the tenant's serious health problem arises.

It goes without saying that, if an illness can be taken care of at home, then services provided by visiting nurses and homemaker programs should be called upon.

In its narrowest dimension, what we have is a housing-medical question. We need to determine where the responsibility for solution rests and what kinds of services and facilities are needed. It seems to me that LHA's might well try to get concerned groups together to see what solutions are possible in a given locality. Since the problem of tenants who can no longer live independently is primarily one of health, local health departments might be a point of contact and a source of assistance, as well as local community welfare councils, councils on aging, and other service agencies.

HEALTH-HOUSING EFFORT

Even though the major questions faced here seem to be the responsibility of health agencies, administrators of publicly supported housing, both morally and practically, cannot avoid taking on a share of the responsibility for finding answers to the questions. Certainly, no one in good conscience could evict a sick older person who has no place to go. Just as the public housing program has, over the years, accepted and attempted to discharge a host of social welfare responsibilities quite beyond the landlord function, so, too, it must seek appropriate and humane local solutions to this most difficult problem. In short, its interest must often substitute for family and friend; in housing for the elderly, this function frequently becomes a practical matter of operations.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE ON CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND THE NEED FOR GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, crime in America and in particular in the Nation's Capital is one of the most pressing problems facing each and every one of us.

President Johnson, in his message to the Congress on the District of Columbia, has described crime in Washington as "the first problem of the Nation's first city."

The situation could no better be described than in the President's own words.

As one means of attacking rising crime in Washington, the President has once again urged the Congress to enact gun control legislation.

I certainly agree and I urge my colleagues to give favorable consideration to pending firearms legislation for the District of Columbia.

If anyone doubts the need for such controls, I ask him to examine the preliminary 1967 crime statistics for the District that were released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation just yesterday.

The Nation's Capital outstrips the country in increases in crimes of violence, including murder and robbery.

Nationally, murder increased 12 percent; murder in Washington increased 26 percent.

Nationally, armed robbery increased 30 percent; in the Nation's Capital, armed robbery soared a staggering 52 percent.

Fifty-three thousand Americans were assaulted with guns in 1967, an increase of 22 percent; in the Nation's Capital which already has one of the highest

aggravated assault rates in the country such crimes jumped 7 percent.

As a part of my own efforts to obtain passage of a Federal firearms law, I should like to refer to the preliminary results of a study that the subcommittee has been concerned with since late 1967.

It is often argued by the gun interests that further gun controls would have no appreciable effect on the Nation's murder rates. They claim that most murders are of the "impulse" type. They usually point to the large number of cases where one family member kills another. They argue that these murderers are not criminal and therefore, even if gun controls were enacted, they could, because of their non-criminal backgrounds, purchase firearms lawfully.

This argument concerned me and other members of the subcommittee and this was the reason that I directed the subcommittee staff to determine just what are the backgrounds of America's murderers.

Our nationwide survey is now being compiled. However, I can report on our results in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, which I believe is substantially representative of the Nation.

First, we found that 78 percent of all murderers studied had prior criminal records.

Second, the gun killer, in whom we are most interested, had such a record in 80 percent of the cases.

His profile reflects that he had six prior arrests before killing another human being. And two of these arrests were for serious offenses.

Third, in 60 percent of the cases, the gun killer had been arrested for a crime of violence before he murdered another person.

Clearly, then, it is not the normal family man turned suddenly into an impulse killer who is responsible for the great bulk of the murders committed.

The circumstances surrounding the murder and the relationship of the defendant to the victim, contrary to what the gun runners say, prove to me that gun controls would be most helpful in curbing these violent and wanton crimes, which are increasing each year.

We found that in 81 percent of the cases, the defendant and victim were either friends, relatives, acquaintances, husband and wife or common law cohabitators. In addition, in 86 percent of the cases, the murder stemmed from an argument, a fight, an altercation, or a lovers' quarrel.

When one considers these facts, in addition to the lengthy previous criminal records of these murderers, then I believe that it is a reasonable conclusion that the enactment of further gun controls are mandatory in curbing such crimes.

We are now compiling similar data for the rest of the Nation, and our preliminary survey shows that the results of this effort will be similar to those that we found to exist in the Nation's Capital. I plan to present to the Senate the results of this study in the coming weeks.

Clearly, the agonizing facts are before the Congress.

We need a comprehensive gun law in the Nation's Capital.

We need a comprehensive Federal law for the country.

I have been advocating strong local and Federal gun control laws to disarm the criminal, so has President Johnson, and so have hosts of other responsible legislators. None of these proposals would harm or limit the hunter, the sportsman, or the hobbyist.

The aim of this legislation is to cut the supply of guns to the criminal, the defective, and others who should not carry, own, or possess a firearm.

These findings demand, indeed cry out, for the passage of strong effective local and Federal firearms control laws.

In both Houses of Congress such strong legislation is pending. It has been cleared through subcommittees.

What are we waiting for?

SNCC'S PLANS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial broadcast over station WMAL during the week of February 18, 1968, entitled "SNCC's Plans for the Schools."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNCC'S PLANS FOR THE SCHOOLS

A thought so obviously fraught with militant Coordinating Committee's timing is atrocious.

The elected District school board bill hangs in the balance, one step from final Congressional approval.

So SNCC chose this time to announce plans to organize teachers, parents and students. Stokely Carmichael told the Roosevelt High School student body that SNCC will "take over" the District schools.

As usual, the so-called Student Non-Violent chief is sure to create concern in Congress. Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia said Monday he will ask Congress to intervene if SNCC does attempt to organize the schools. And "Congressional intervention" could spell doom for the elected school board bill.

We will soon find out how much real concern SNCC and Carmichael have for the District schools. The best thing SNCC can do for the schools is leave them alone.

THE URBAN FUTURE

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the publication Nation's Cities has begun a series of articles on "The Urban Future" which focus on the rapid technological changes currently taking place in the Nation and the needed government responses to such changes.

It is fitting that this magazine has launched this series by interviewing the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and a leading authority on the Nation's environmental problems.

I invite particular attention to Senator MUSKIE's discussion of his proposal for a Select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment, and to his observations on the need for establishing priorities and allocating our resource dollars where they are most needed, or of focusing them in terms of the problems of the cities.

Mr. President, I commend the article to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE URBAN FUTURE: CAN WE KEEP PACE WITH TECHNOLOGY'S FALLOUT?

(With this issue, Nation's Cities begins a continuing series of articles on "The Urban Future," designed to focus on the rapid technological changes currently taking place in our society and the needed municipal government responses to such changes.

(It is fitting, we think, to kick off this important series by interviewing Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine) who wants the Senate to set up a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. During the hearings which Senator Muskie conducted last year on this proposal, he noted:

"Man's technology is national and international, but his environment is really a local matter. How we improve his environment in large part depends upon how well state and local governments plan and program their efforts to meet public needs. They are the first to feel the pressures from the people to do something about these problems because these governments are on the firing line of human activity."

(Daniel Bell, chairman of the Commission on the Year 2000 (sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences), also has recognized this. Said he:

"The only prediction about the future that one can make with certainty is that public authorities will face more problems than they have at any previous time in history. . . .

"The problem of the future consists in defining one's priorities and making the necessary commitments."

(In the coming months, Nation's Cities will endeavor to pinpoint some of these priorities of the future.)

Question. Senator Muskie, you had extensive hearings last year on Senate Resolution No. 68 to establish a select Senate Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. Could you tell us about the origin of those hearings, the outcome of your efforts to have the select committee formed, and the purposes which this committee would serve?

Answer. The idea had its origins in the work of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. Here we have had first-hand exposure to the problems of a changing and deteriorating environment, especially in our cities. Secondly, legislation in recent years dealing with the economic growth and development, as well as legislation dealing with the environment, generally, and the urban environment, specifically, had disclosed the overlapping jurisdiction of Senate committees today.

I happen to be on three Senate committees: Government Operations, Public Works, and Banking and Currency, and after nine years on these committees, I find myself discussing the same subject in each of them. Each committee is approaching urban problems from a different angle. The overlapping jurisdiction of the committees and the multi-faceted aspect of these problems are a reflection of the growing complexity and interdependence of our society, our economy, and our people. Changing technology has so changed these problems in terms of solutions to them that legislation is almost obsolete and out of date before it is enacted.

Out of all of this it became evident to me that it would be useful if we had such a special committee. Its members would come from five basic legislative committees, and the members would develop some background on and understanding of the prospects of technological change, not only to-

morrow, but over the next 50 years. This, of course, has to be "guesstimating" in a sense, but an appreciation for technological change and also some thinking about what this would mean to people, are necessary.

So, I introduced the resolution to create such a special committee, and we undertook, in the 1966-67 hearings, to put together a sample of what such a committee might do, the kinds of subjects it might get involved in, and the kinds of witnesses it might take testimony from. We thought that this would be the best way to sell the idea of the special committee. I think we had some very interesting and stimulating hearings. They were a good sample. Even with that kind of demonstration, it isn't easy to get a new committee created, and we haven't yet received a committee report on the resolution.

The whole idea, of course, of looking into the future isn't new with this resolution or with this subcommittee. It is the sort of thing that increasing numbers of people and groups are doing all over the country. You begin to run into them as you generate this kind of activity.

Question. The Year 2000 Commission and some of these other groups?

Answer. Yes. There also was a network television show this past year, "The 21st Century." We incorporated the text of the programs into the hearings. This is fascinating stuff in and of its own. But, I think there is a serious legislative need and use for this kind of contemplation and reflection; so, I hope we get to it.

Question. This select committee you envision would be a way of coordinating and drawing together all of these things. In that regard, do you foresee the future need for a new federal department of, say, environmental health, which would bring together the now scattered agencies dealing with air and water pollution, solid waste disposal, and other types of pollutants that affect all citizens?

Answer. It is difficult to anticipate government organizational patterns of tomorrow, but this is certainly a logical one that might well develop.

Federal departments now are organized on operational or functional lines, rather than environmental lines. Whether we can or should convert from what we now have to that is a question. It is not possible to pigeonhole subjects along environmental lines entirely. It is easy to suggest that we should relate all activities dealing with water use, water supply, and water pollution together in one agency. Inevitably, however, when you have achieved the maximum concentration that you can in this respect, you find that you still have to recognize the jurisdictional interests of other departments in the same resource.

For example, it is logical from one point of view to think of air and water pollution as being in the same agency, and yet, my view at the moment is that air pollution is primarily a health problem whereas water pollution is a health, water supply, recreational, industrial, agricultural, and water quality problem. These problems don't necessarily all go together.

So that while air and water pollution—in terms of the techniques of enforcement, the development of the policy, and the development of standards—might be thought of as belonging in the same agency, I would at the moment resist that answer to the organizational problem. But, it could change.

Question. The amount of money that the federal government is now spending on research and development activity is very substantial. Do you think there is a way now to channel some of these new developments into urban technology?

Answer. I suspect that we are not doing an orderly and systematic job of establishing priorities and allocating our resource dol-

lars where they are most needed, or of focusing them in terms of the problems of the cities. Like almost all federal programs, they have just grown without any overall relationship to what we are trying to achieve in establishing priorities or evaluating results.

The Bureau of the Budget, of course, is now concerned in evaluating all programs in terms of results, in terms of performance criteria, and in terms of returns for the dollars spent. I think increasingly Congress will have to do the same, and as we do, I think we will see recommendations for consolidation of programs.

Your question is related specifically to research, but I think we are going to have to do it with respect to all programs in the social and economic fields, including the resource field. We proceed on the assumption there is no limit to what we spend provided we can justify each program on its merits. But obviously there are limits, especially in this period of a war economy. There also are limits to our resources. We will have to limit spending and to establish priorities.

In connection with research dollars, I don't have the figures at my finger tips, but I suspect that a large proportion of our research money goes into the weapons and defense fields. This is where the great federal research effort began after World War II. We have begun to branch off into non-military fields more recently and with relatively fewer dollars. In recent years we have authorized a considerable amount of research money for air and water pollution control, but, I suspect there are other research areas we ought to be getting into in the domestic non-military field. And research, I think, is going to have to be reoriented. I hope sooner than later that we can turn more dollars now being spent in the military field to the non-military field.

Question. There is obviously a good bit of technology available that could be utilized to deal with urban problems but it has been very slow in being adopted at the state and local level. Were you able to identify any of the reasons for this in any of your hearings or do you have any other personal observations?

Answer. I can't recall that there was too much testimony directly on that point in these hearings. I think we know what the answer is in connection with such problems as air pollution. There hasn't been the will to apply available technology. Available technology could make quite a difference in the quality of the air in a great many of our metropolitan areas if community will develop, and if that will were imposed upon the polluters.

We could do a great deal if every metropolitan area were to do as much as Los Angeles, for example, has done in making use of available technology to control air pollution. There would be a marked improvement in the air quality in cities like New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh and others that have an aggravated problem, including Washington. It is clear in the case of water quality, in the case of air quality, in the case of transportation, and in so many other areas that we are not using available technology.

We fail to do so in part because of the lack of community will; secondly, in part because dollars aren't available to do the job; and in part, as in the case of modern transportation, because the public isn't quite ready to use the modern transportation that technology would make possible. We have an education and selling job here that hasn't been done. At some point, I suppose, automobile traffic, especially commuter travel in our cities, will get to be so inconvenient and uncomfortable that public transportation in the new technological forms will be demanded by the motoring public.

I suspect that the field in which we really

have done too little in developing or using technology is housing. Technology may hold some of the answers to the problem of housing for lower income groups, maybe better answers than public housing. Many people have wondered why we haven't somehow used the techniques that developed trailer housing to develop more acceptable and lower cost conventional housing for lower income groups; but, we haven't done it for some reason.

Question. It has been said that one of the reasons the private sector hasn't been as innovating with urban technology as it has in military or space technology is that we haven't been able to demonstrate that there is a ready market which will absorb the product of the research, development, and production. Do you think that federal programs, particularly grant-in-aid programs, can be modeled in such a way that they can help stimulate some kind of a market?

Answer. We always have to deal with the defense mechanism of established technology, in housing especially. Every time we try to write into federal housing legislation policies designed to stimulate the development of new materials and new technology, there is always the resistance of those who have a vested interest in existing materials, existing technology, existing methods of building houses, existing labor supply, and so on.

I don't know that a determined enough effort has been made yet to overcome this resistance. I think perhaps this may not be the time to try because of the tight money market and the slow-down in the whole building picture. I think, however, we will have to push the government policy eventually to get some of this development started and in being.

Question. You played a major role in steering the Model Cities program through the Congress. Do you have some hope that this might open up some of these doors?

Answer. I don't know that it will. The concept behind the Model Cities, of course, is that the program ought to get at the human element of the problems of the cities rather than the physical element.

I don't really see the Model Cities program leading to that kind of development. It might in individual cases, especially in the case of a large city like New York, which, because of its size and of its housing market, might be able to exert heavy enough pressure, just as California did in the case of pollution from automobiles. California was a large enough market so that when California said to the industry, "You can't sell cars here unless they meet certain air quality standards," the industry had to listen, did listen, and did produce the cars. If the State of Maine had done that, the automobile industry would have probably said, "If you do that to us, you can drive your horses." But, California had the economic muscle to get some results from the industry.

So, it is possible, I suppose, that if in New York, for example, in connection with a deteriorated or blighted neighborhood, it was decided by those who initiate the local Model Cities plan that they want to demonstrate and to develop some new housing technology, they could exert enough economic muscle to get some movement out of the industry. Short of that, however, I doubt that the Model Cities program could stimulate innovation, unless industry can be stimulated just by ideas.

There are so many exciting things, it seems to me, that could be done in housing. I know that there are some innovating and imaginative thinkers in the housing field. Certainly among the planners and the architects in this field there are some imaginative possibilities. But, there has been a great deal of resistance to change, advance, and progress, at least the kind of advance and progress that actually mate-

rializes in the form of housing for people who need it.

Question. What function or what particular action do you think that local governments can take to open up better utilization of technology in such fields as this?

Answer. Speaking especially of housing?

Question. The range. You mentioned housing particularly and this is a very important question to the urban city, but there is a wide range. You also mentioned transportation, water pollution.

Answer. A given local community could stimulate thinking and ideas, but I think in order for those ideas to result in innovation either in technology or in its use, you've got to get acceptance of those ideas on a much broader scale. Of course, sometimes one city may make effective use, say, of a new transportation mode that might excite interest of others and result in the spread of an idea and the acceptance of that mode on a wide scale.

But I can't recall any instance of a community, by reason of its own thinking or initiative, actually prodding or stimulating or exciting industry to develop something that was not in being before, unless it is, as in the case of California, a large enough economic force. And there they did it by compulsion, not by stimulus.

Question. This really suggests, doesn't it, that if there is really going to be any meaningful readjustment in the use of new technology at the urban level, it is going to have to be stimulated, the market supported, the leverages developed, at some level other than at the individual community level?

Answer. In order to get private industry to invest in necessary research and production facilities to develop new technology, they have to see a profit. There is this potential for profit, of course, in homes for middle income and higher income groups, but for lower income groups, unless a builder or builders are convinced of the existence of a mass market, they are not as likely to innovate.

If the profit quotient is not sufficient to meet the particular social problem that is troublesome—and this at the present time is housing for lower middle income groups—then there has to be some other sponsorship for this kind of advancement in technology. I am afraid this can mean a federal role or governmental role at the state or local level if they are large enough. I wish that there were greater risk taking in the private sector in this field, but there hasn't been and I am not sure there will be without either a prod or an incentive provided by government. That at least seems to be the lesson of the last 34 years.

Question. Are there any pending pieces of legislation which might provide this prod to industry?

Answer. No. As I say, the mildest kind of legislative policy in this respect has been resisted. That is what I think can be one of the values of the Special Committee on Technology and the Human Environment that we have been talking about. Here is a forum that will have the prestige of the five constituent Senate legislative committees behind it, prestige to attract public attention to the hearings that such a committee would hold, as well as the attention of the experts who would testify. I think that we could bring exposure to stimulating new ideas that might finally prod industry, or might finally result in new policy to stimulate or prod industry. The committee's greatest value might be as a showcase for new ideas.

Incidentally, I think it is of interest that Senator Howard H. Baker Jr., who is on the Republican side (from Tennessee) on our Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, has been very interested in this resolution. He and I together wrote to people across the country calling their attention to the resolution and to what we hoped it might accom-

plish. Senator Baker has put in the *Congressional Record* the replies he received from hundreds of these people who see this as an exciting way of moving us into a brighter technological future. People are excited about it. It is amazing that apparently a dry little organizational resolution should have the attraction that this one has had.

Question. In all this talk about rapid change and the complexity of modern technology, isn't there a danger that lack of real comprehension of these technological developments on the part of citizen leaders and on the part of elected officials at all levels of government could lead to an undue reliance on the technicians and the scientists in planning what they think is good for the rest of their countrymen?

Answer. I think that is what has happened to us up to now, and it has produced results that we ought to try to avoid. Again, I get back to air pollution for an illustration of what I mean.

Somebody made the decision to develop the internal combustion engine as a source of power for the automobile, and it has turned out to be a mistake from the air pollution point of view. If somebody had made a decision to develop the electric automobile, for example, I suspect by now we would have a very good electric automobile without the air pollution problem. It may have had other problems, but it would not have been the prime source of air pollution. Just to pose a point of view, if our internal combustion cars were a mistake, the special committee might have suggested how it could have been averted.

In a democratic society we don't want decisions on production made by a president or a ruler. They have to be made as a result of the operations of the private enterprise system. But I think, by exposing the emerging new technology to the examination of those who are concerned with the social problems, the welfare problems, and the human problems of American society, before the technology moves into the market place and before it begins to influence the environment, we might be able to inhibit, or encourage or to direct its use in some respects so that we can avoid mistakes.

For instance, pesticides and insecticides have been loosed into the atmosphere and into food chains and life chains before we really know what the ultimate impact may be.

I remember the hearings we had last year on lead in the atmosphere from automobiles. There are traces of lead in animal life at the North Pole that come somehow from the atmosphere, presumably from this part of the globe, not from that part up there. We have let loose these chemicals and these forces into our environment without fully appreciating, or without even trying to come to an appreciation of, the long-term consequences.

You will recall in the 1956 presidential campaign that the question of radioactive fallout from A-bomb testing was in issue. Adlai Stevenson at that time said we ought to stop experimenting in the atmosphere. There were some "guesstimates" in the hectic last weeks of the campaign from competing scientists, those who endorsed President Eisenhower's point of view and those who endorsed Mr. Stevenson's point of view as to what were the long-term dangers to the human race from fallout. Even the most conservative guesses have proven to be not conservative enough. In other words, the danger was greater than the worst alarmists at that time thought. The safeguards that have been taken since have not been adequate, and we are still living with that long-term consequence, which in some respects may be irrevocable.

These are the sort of aspects about technology we need to try to anticipate. All new technology has a fallout. We have paid too little attention in the past to that fallout

and what it might mean for human beings and life on earth.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH'S ADDRESS TO NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NRECA IN DALLAS, TEX., FEBRUARY 26, 1968

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, February 26, I had the great pleasure to address several thousand national rural leaders in attendance at the 26th annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Their meeting in Dallas was an outstanding one, climaxed by the surprise visit of President Johnson on Wednesday.

As a native of a small rural Texas town, I know the hardships that rural residents faced before electric power became available to them. I believe that the singlemost significant event in the long history of U.S. agricultural development lies in the creation and growth of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The members of the NRECA are the men who made that growth so remarkable and they are the men who have dedicated themselves to lighting up rural America.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

A STRONG R.E.A. MEANS A STRONGER AMERICA

What a pleasant assignment what a happy honor! I am privileged to welcome to my home state you nine to ten thousand representatives, delegates, officials, and families to this great national meeting of the N.R.E.C.A.

It is a real privilege to mark with you this passage of a third of a century of R.E.A. progress in America. It is my happy honor to welcome the officials of the Rural Electric Co-ops, with 5.6 million connections furnishing light and power to 20 million Americans, to the largest R.E.A. state in the nation. We have 448,000 connections in Texas serving 1.8 million Texans. Nearly one-tenth of all the people in the United States who are served by the R.E.A. live here in Texas.

I say "Fellow R.E.A.'s" because I was appointed in February of 1935 by the late Governor James V. Alford to the Board of the Lower Colorado River Authority of Texas, a public authority which has developed the Colorado of Texas with six dams and serves many R.E.A. co-op members. That was before the R.E.A. was created in that landmark year of 1935, first by executive order of Franklin D. Roosevelt, next by a law passed by the Congress under the legislative generalship of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

You might be interested to know that my home district of Austin sent to Congress in 1937 a young congressman pledged under the F.D.R. platform to fight for a stronger R.E.A. In 1939 Franklin D. Roosevelt offered to appoint him national director of the Rural Electrification Administration. After careful consideration he decided to stay in Congress. Today he is President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, a long-time friend and strong supporter of the R.E.A.

So this is a pleasure to me to welcome you to the greatest state in the union on so many accounts. It is the state which furnished the legislative leadership to write R.E.A. into law, with Speaker Sam Rayburn in the House and Senators Morris Sheppard and Tom Connally in the Senate. Texas was a strong arm for F.D.R. in the creation of the R.E.A. With another R.E.A.-oriented Texan, Lyndon Johnson, in the White House

today, I have a right to be proud of Texas' role in R.E.A. development. Without you, rural America would be like the rural Roman empire in its latter days, a land deserted of people, denuded of top soil, dying.

Now rural America is alive, thanks to your own efforts. Now the entire nation is waking up to the fact that if rural America withers on the vine, urban America will explode in the streets. Every time limited opportunity drives a family from the rural areas, it enlarges the problems of the urban areas.

The same people who were glibly proposing a few years ago to get the small family farmers off the land, saying they were too small to be efficient, never thought through to the end result of weakening America. Now they are eating their words and are advocating a rural America for more, not fewer, people.

And then there's Clyde Ellis. For the past 25 years Clyde Ellis has knowledgeably and efficiently led your fight for the farmers, ranchers and rural residents of our nation. He has worked hard for beneficial laws, and has helped beat back bad laws.

The program for a better life for rural America began more than a century ago when Abraham Lincoln created the Bureau of Agriculture and signed the Morrill Land Grant College Act, to create institutions of higher learning in mechanics and agriculture, and raised both to a professional level.

Rural living received great boosts around the turn of the century, with rural free delivery of mail and with the widespread establishment of rural public schools.

But its greatest boost came in the 1930's with Franklin D. Roosevelt and George W. Norris of Nebraska making T.V.A. a public authority, creating the R.E.A. program for light and power on the farms and ranches of our nation, and with Sam Rayburn's successful program for farm-to-market all-weather roads, helping to get farm production to market and farm children to school.

These post-World War II decades have seen another greatly needed development, rural electric telephone cooperatives spreading fast communications over the land. Rural telephone loans have brought telephone service to nearly 180,000 Texas families, nearly a million people in Texas alone.

By your successes you have trained rural leadership and have proven that rural America can manage money and business enterprises. The Farmers Home Administration is a great success in America today, partly because a generation of R.E.A. activity has developed much leadership in rural America. The Farmers Home Administration Water District Loans are also adding a new chapter to the comfort, health, and desirability and productiveness of rural living, but only because you have the power there to pump the water.

Welcome again! A thousand times welcome! We are proud to have you in Texas, where the initials R.E.A. have come to mean for us real economic achievement.

I recall your meeting here in Dallas on March 12, 1964, an election year. There was a candidate that year—can't recall his name—who wasn't exactly a friend of the R.E.A. He wanted to give the Tennessee Valley Authority back to the exploiters and let the special interests take charge in that great Southland region.

Even the special interests were appalled at that suggestion, because they knew they couldn't possibly give T.V.A. members the kind of service they get today at the same low cost. The voters let that 1964 candidate know in the clearest way possible that they didn't buy his plan to take rural electrification out of the hands of the people.

So here we are in 1968, another election year. So far none of the would-be candidates has said much about R.E.A., or about doing away with it. Perhaps they've learned their lesson. But the threat of four years ago, and

the threat that has always loomed as a danger to our great rural electrification program, has not vanished. It doesn't take a college professor or an economist to see the health impact that electric co-ops have had on Texas and on the nation.

This is an election year, but it is a year for economy as well. We are fighting a hard and very expensive war 12,000 miles from here in Vietnam, costing billions of dollars. We in the Congress are being urged to hold down new programs, to curtail old ones, to cut back on all domestic spending.

Already the enemies of the R.E.A. are using this economizing as a handy excuse to try to destroy rural electric programs. They are calling for drastic reductions in spending and limitations on expansion, but, frankly, some of the people and the special interest groups pumping for these cutbacks in R.E.A. are the very ones who have consistently fought you. They are the same ones who would sell the T.V.A. They are the propagandists who want to put our rural residents at the mercy of special interests and free them to charge whatever they wish. You know of the fight we had last year to save our G & T loan programs.

There is no doubt that the rural sector and the R.E.A.s are feeling the cost of the war. The Bureau of the Budget has proposed only \$345 million this year for R.E.A. programs, down from \$390 million last year. Similar reductions are in the works for most other sections of the Department of Agriculture.

Cutting the R.E.A. will not help the urban-rural crisis. It will worsen it. The urban crisis has developed largely because we have driven 20 million people from the farms of America into the great cities over the past 25 years. We cannot let the rural areas wither in neglect and still expect peace, quiet and prosperity in the cities.

We need power and light and telephone service reaching out to every farm and ranch in the United States for a prosperous agricultural sector. R.E.A. is the authority dedicated to furnishing it. We need clean water on the farms and ranches of America to insure the health which is basic to all happiness and prosperity. R.E.A. is essential to pump that water into the homes and shops and stores of rural America. R.E.A. is ready.

You have other important issues before the Congress this year. I don't want to infringe upon the subjects of your other distinguished speakers, including Congresswoman Sullivan, Congressman Whitten, and my colleague, Senator Pearson of Kansas.

I do want to mention two major bills before us this year, the Electric Power Reliability Act and the Aiken-Kennedy Bill. Both will insure a continued role of prominence for rural electric cooperatives in research and expansion. I intend to work for passage of these bills without the watering-down amendments that are likely to be proposed.

And so you see, fellow Americans, that we have much to do in 1968. The voices of opposition are not so loud right now, but they are more dangerous than ever. Let us have no illusions here in Dallas as you open this wonderful 26th annual meeting: you cannot let your guard down. In the clamor of foreign war there is always danger to domestic progress. Under the cover of loud public discussions about war, the enemies of progress at home quietly work away the foundation of our hope. Let us be watchful. Let us be vigilant.

The writer Elbert Hubbard said that anybody who is anybody and who does anything is surely going to be criticized, vilified, and misunderstood. This is part of the penalty for greatness. This is the sort of greatness that the R.E.A.s of America can endure, because you are serving the people.

You have a third of a century of achievement behind you. I welcome you to my home state of Texas, and to the opening of the second third of a century of progress for the

N.R.E.C.A. Wherever there is an R.E.A. coop, then you can say, "There live dedicated men."

The Lord said, "Let there be light, and there was light."

A great philosopher said "We need more light."

The R.E.A. is dedicated to giving more light!

J.F.K. said "Let all who serve our Democracy do so with a dedication that will light a fire whose glow will inspire all the world." R.E.A. is helping turn on the lights all over the world. The glow from your light will inspire all mankind.

AFL-CIO RESOLUTION URGES SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TO ACT PROMPTLY ON GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, almost 20 years have passed since the United States fought for—and voted for—adoption of the Genocide Convention in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

But, although the United States urged immediate ratification by all the member states of the U.N., it still has not done so itself.

The delegates to the recent AFL-CIO convention pointed out that the failure of the United States to act favorably on the Genocide Convention "casts serious doubt upon the sincerity of our Nation's professed moral principles."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the AFL-CIO resolution entitled "Genocide Convention."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 109—GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Whereas, The General Assembly of the United Nations, on Dec. 9, 1948, adopted the Genocide Convention which makes a crime of acts "committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group as such", and

Whereas, Although the United States played a leading role in urging its adoption, voted for it, and urged immediate ratification by all member states; and although 65 member states have signed the convention, the United States is conspicuous by its absence among the signatories. This casts serious doubt upon the sincerity of our nation's professed moral principles; therefore, be it

Resolved: That the AFL-CIO urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to recommend ratification as soon as possible and urge the Senate to act promptly and favorably on that recommendation; and be it further

Resolved: That we call upon the President to use the great weight of his office to bring about prompt ratification of the Genocide Convention by the United States.

RESTRAINTS ON SALE OF FIREARMS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the number of deaths from firearms, both accidental and intentional, grows year after year. Proposals to put reasonable restraints on the uncontrolled sale of firearms, by mail order and over the counter, have been before Congress for years. Despite frequent claims to the contrary, neither the purpose nor the effect of such proposals is to curb hunters or hobbyists. As evidence of wide public support for such a

law, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions on firearms control adopted by the recent AFL-CIO convention be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 50—AFL-CIO SEEKS STRONG FEDERAL FIREARMS LAW

Whereas, The uncontrolled sale of firearms remains one of the principal factors in crime and accidental death and wounding, and was a factor in the assassination of our late President, John F. Kennedy, and

Whereas, The number of Americans killed by firearms in the United States during the last 10 years is many times the number of American soldiers lost in Viet Nam, and

Whereas, Studies indicate that a high proportion—possibly one-fourth—of the persons who order guns from mail-order dealers have criminal records and thus could be purchasing firearms for illicit purposes; therefore, be it

Resolved: That the AFL-CIO actively support federal legislation which—while not curbing the hunter or gun hobbyist—will bring the sale of firearms under at least partial control by banning the interstate sale of firearms through mail-order.

DR. BERNARD GORDON ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Vietnam debate is more often than not conducted within the context of current events and immediate history. Seldom does anyone look at the problems that this Nation faces in Asia from an historical point of view and in a long-range perspective. Furthermore, our present problems are often so consuming that we fail to realize that much progress is being made by the free nations of Southeast Asia in the fields of economics, regional development, and regional cooperation.

Dr. Bernard K. Gordon, of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research of Johns Hopkins University, appeared before the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and presented a most helpful description of free world developments in that troubled part of the world. I think Dr. Gordon's analysis is a fine contribution to the intense debate now going on regarding American involvement in Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. BERNARD K. GORDON, WASHINGTON CENTER OF FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH OF JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, AND RESEARCH ANALYSIS CORP.

(NOTE.—Dr. Gordon is the author of *The Dimensions of Conflict in Southeast Asia* (1966); a number of articles on foreign policy and international politics; and an earlier book on the foreign policy of New Zealand. He is Chairman of the Regional Development Seminar of SEADAG (Southeast Asian Development Advisory Group) and Project Chairman on Southeast Asia at Research Analysis Corporation. He is presently completing a book to be called "Asian Regionalism and the Balance of Power." He has been a Consultant at the Naval War College and has several times traveled in Southeast Asia.)

The subcommittee has asked me to speak, not about Asian regionalism alone, but about "United States political interests in Asian regionalism and cooperation." I am delighted that the question was put that way, because it establishes a standard—a standard against which to evaluate certain foreign trends, and a standard against which to judge possible responses by our government. For no matter how intrinsically interesting regional cooperation may be in any part of the world, it can usefully be evaluated by American policy-makers only after answering this question: what part of the United States national interest does this development affect?

For that reason I will aim to identify three main points in my remarks:

First, the relationship between the Asian interests and objectives of the United States and the concept of regional cooperation;

Second, the nature of contemporary trends in Asian regionalism, and the likely results that can be projected from those trends; and

Third, the nature of appropriate American responses to those developments, taking into account the United States interests and objectives that have been identified.

I. THE UNITED STATES INTEREST

While there has always been much debate about the involvements of the United States in East Asia, and for that reason a great deal of seeming confusion about our purposes, our actual record of foreign policy behavior shows remarkable consistency. It shows that since the turn of the century the United States has had a single over-riding national interest, which was well expressed by President Johnson at Honolulu a little over a year ago: "No single nation," he said, "can or should be permitted to dominate the Pacific region."

This was the underlying rationale for our opposition to Japan, beginning under President Wilson, and continued in 1920–22 by President Harding and in 1932 by President Hoover. It continued under President Roosevelt with the 1937 Quarantine speech, and culminated in the various embargoes and restrictions in 1940–41.

Walter Lippmann noticed this constancy in 1944. He wrote that "the remarkable thing about the record of these forty years is the constancy with which the United States government has stood for the integrity of Chinese territory." I would argue just with those last few words, for our commitment to China was only the reflection of our deeper concern: that no one nation, whatever its name or policy, be permitted to dominate all of East Asia. Had Japan succeeded in the conquest of China then Japan would have become dominant in East Asia. When China herself began to emerge from a century of weakness we found that we had to begin to oppose China's own hegemonic ambitions. Indeed, this had been predicted: in 1942, Nicholas Spykman of Yale wrote that while Japan had to be defeated, after the war "the United States will have to adopt a . . . protective policy toward Japan."

Some have called this "balance of power," and have concluded that that constitutes the vital American national interest in Asia. I hesitate to take issue, but there is a fundamental oversight there, and it relates to regionalism today. For "balance of power" has been the method that we have used when conditions in Asia have allowed for that method. But because our over-riding national interest has been to prevent one-nation dominance, we have not hesitated to rely on our own, unilateral power to preserve our interest in Asia.

The war against Japan was unilateral; as was the decision to stand and fight in Korea, although that had UN support. The decision in 1964 to prevent the over-running of South Vietnam was equally unilateral, though others help us there too. We have in other words always welcomed the support of other nations, but when there seemed no alter-

native to acting alone, that has been our course.

This has been the pattern since the 1920's. The Nine-Power Treaty of 1922 was an ineffective effort to promote the American national interest by adding to it a multilateral endorsement. In the 1930's we gradually realized that others did not share our deep interest in preventing one-nation dominance in East Asia, but only so late that war could not be avoided. In academic terminology, the structure of East Asian international politics became increasingly bipolar. Before 1915 it was multipolar, and by 1940 it was very tightly bipolar. In a tight bipolar structure somebody backs down, or war results.

Since the end of the Pacific war we have been gamely trying to return to that multipolar structure, and when all we could achieve instead was the appearance of multipolarity we settled for that. This is the meaning of ANZUS and SEATO; of the UN endorsement of our Korean action; and of the Manila Conference of 1966. In that respect the Manila meeting is very reminiscent of the Pacific War Council, which we created in 1943.

Thus while our interest has remained constant, we have been uneasy with the bipolar structure often necessary to preserve that interest. We have as a result tried to keep alive the possibility of a return to multipolarity. It is in that perspective that Asian regional cooperation bears upon the most vital interests of the United States in the Pacific area.

II. ASIAN REGIONALISM: LIKELY OUTCOMES

Much of this, it might be said, was just as true when SEATO was formed, and yet the United States has still had to bear the main burden of Asian security on its own shoulders. Why, in essence, is the goal of a multipolar Asia any more realistic today than it was before? The bulk of the answer lies in one term: *indigenous interest*. By that I mean that unlike our promotion of regional economic cooperation in 1955, or our identification with defense cooperation in 1954, today the great interest in regional cooperation comes from within Asia, and especially Southeast Asia.

This interest is based on several factors: greatly changed perceptions of China; the increasingly pragmatic style of many foreign policies in the region; and the very strong feeling, even among nations we call our closest Southeast Asian allies, that they cannot become "their own men" so long as they remain greatly dependent on the United States. Each factor deserves to be understood, and I do describe them in detail in the book I am now completing. I call it "Asian Regionalism and the Balance of Power." For the time being, let me say that the convergence of these factors has made a major qualitative difference in the meaning and prospects for Asian regional cooperation.

One reflection of this difference is in the very number of regional efforts that have taken place in the 1960's: they include the creation of ASA (Association of Southeast Asia) in 1961; MAPHILINDO in 1963; the initiatives of ECAFE (the UN Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East) which helped lead to the establishment of the Asian Development Bank; ASPAC (the Asian and Pacific Council); the Southeast Asian Ministerial Conferences on Education and on Transport; and ASEAN (the Association of Southeast Asian Nations), established just last August.

These are not all equally important; ASEAN, along with the Asian Development Bank, probably far outshadows the rest in significance. I have listed all only to show the pace of this interest in regionalism. It reflects the high-level attention which the idea now attracts in the area.

ASEAN should be singled out because of

Indonesia's participation, and Indonesia is the world's fifth largest nation. In the past it was always said that so long as Indonesia did not participate in a group devoted to pragmatic cooperation, the idea would never go anywhere. ASEAN meets that objective, whereas MAPHILINDO—the other body which Indonesia joined—was only one of Sukarno's tactics for the break-up of Malaysia. In contrast, and as a direct descendant of the smaller, ASA, ASEAN combines the down-to-earth goals which Thailand and Malaysia stressed in ASA, along with the prominence, size, and attractiveness of non-alignment that only Indonesia commands in Southeast Asia.

ASEAN is also a reminder that it is Southeast Asia, rather than in Asia as a whole, where we can expect regional cooperation to take root. We are all familiar with a broader idea: the notion that somehow, a great arc of Asian stability might be formed with India and Japan at each end, and Southeast Asia in the middle. I am convinced that insofar as the next 10–20 years are concerned, this idea represents no more than wishful thinking. India neither perceives herself, nor is perceived by most leaders within Southeast Asia, as a nation of their region. Moreover, the prospects for close ties between the two proposed "key" states in this idea, India and Japan, are bleak. Those who have watched their officials trying to work together may support me in that judgment.

Japan, on the other hand, is pulled already by some of her leaders to play an increasing role in Southeast Asian affairs: they believe that in their own interest they should assist regional cooperation in Southeast Asia. Southeast Asian leaders also regard Japan as "part" of the international system in which they live—certainly more so than India, Australia and New Zealand, or the United States. They realize, moreover, that Japan is the only Asian nation with the resources needed for Southeast Asia's development, regional or otherwise. Even now Japan is the number one trading partner for almost all these nations.

These considerations do not "prove" which nations constitute the Southeast Asia region; it is enough to say that leaders there believe they know what makes up the region. They believe they share a number of problems with the generally small countries in their immediate area, and they are also beginning to believe they "need" regionalism to resolve some of these problems. That is why Southeast Asia, rather than Asia as a whole, is the focus of this activity.

From the American viewpoint this should be welcome, for this is the region where our interests also require more cohesion and stability. Not only is it the weakest of all areas susceptible to Chinese influence, but it is also likely to remain the Number One area of interest to China. Compared to her other long-term interests, Southeast Asia probably appears to China as the region with the best prospect of large payoff for relatively small investment. And indeed this will be so, as long as the nations there remain weak, regionally divided, and dissatisfied with their economic progress.

This is all being realized by the Southeast Asian elites themselves, and if I had just one point to stress it would be this: for the first time the commitment to cooperation in Southeast Asia is genuine; it is more widely based than ever before; and it is worth our support. ASEAN illustrates this, for it would not have been created without a remarkable investment of time and effort by two of the most hard-headed leaders in Southeast Asia: Adam Malik, Indonesia's Foreign Minister, and Thanat Khoman, his counterpart in Thailand.

I have had conversations with both—Thanat Khoman since 1962. He has a clarity and consistency of vision for Thailand, and for Southeast Asia, that is remarkable. It is

because Thanat Khoman and Adam Malik so firmly believe that a more cohesive Southeast Asia is essential to general Asian stability, that they both worked so hard to create ASEAN. Because of that commitment ASEAN may be the format with which the United States must come to grips—but before reaching that judgment let me conclude by considering some alternatives open to the United States.

III. THE APPROPRIATE COURSE FOR THE UNITED STATES

I put into three categories the many groups devoted to Asian regional cooperation. The first is broadest in scope; ECAFE and many of its related projects belong here, as does ASPAC. These are the sounding-boards for the well-intentioned appeals for "cooperation." But because their membership is so wide, and reflects so many styles and interests, I believe little can be expected from most of these high-level efforts.

The second category consists of the "functional" efforts: the Mekong Committee, SEAMES, and the Ministerial Conference on Transport are examples. This category reflects the sophisticated approach to the subject. It says that because broad efforts like ECAFE and smaller ones like Maphilindo have had little significance, let us try cooperation through the functional and technical "experts" in non-controversial fields. This approach aims to steer relatively clear of Foreign Ministers, Prime Ministers, and their attendant "political" problems. This may be the approach now favored by our government, for I note that we have granted funds to such groups as SEAMES and the Asian Productivity Organization.

The third approach is mixed: I call it "pragmatic-political." ASEAN reflects this approach. It is not tied to any functional Ministry or any one purpose, but it does have the support of those in each government who are charged with the nation's foreign policy and political leadership. Behind this approach (this was true for ASA as well), is the frank recognition that security is the ultimate rationale for regional cooperation. Implicitly this approach recognizes that defense cooperation might grow from successful, earlier cooperation on less sensitive subjects.

At the beginning this approach may achieve fewer concrete things than the "functional" model. This is largely because the agreements it reaches will be regarded as having larger implications, with more national "face" and prestige on the line than the strictly functional group. But it is precisely for that reason that the mixed approach will be more durable.

My proposition goes right back to the phrase, "indigenous interest." ASEAN is the product of purely local initiative; its five governments will work for their projects whether or not the United States or the Asian Development Bank helps. ASA created a joint fund; ASEAN probably will do the same, providing an initial pool of \$5 million. SEAMES in contrast has come close to foundering when AID funds were not forthcoming. I have heard one Ambassador state frankly that SEAMES is apparently something Washington likes; if they will provide the money then his government is "willing to go along."

That is not the spirit I found in ASA nor in ASEAN; instead ASEAN reflects what the member governments themselves want to do. For that reason we should consider a "matching grant" arrangement—perhaps through our Asian Bank contribution—with ASEAN. That would ensure that US assistance goes only to projects for which the local governments are willing to spend their own money, in at least equal proportions. I know of no better standard by which to judge commitments.

Finally, ASEAN deserves our attention because some members—Indonesia especially—are already considering joint defense arrangements for the region. That is a strain of

thinking we should endorse, for it could lead to security cooperation against low-level conflict. That, along with economic cooperation, is a step in the direction of multipolarity, or balance of power. Moreover, since I do not believe we will be anxious in the wake of the Viet-Nam war to undertake new guerrilla conflicts in Southeast Asia, anything we can do to reinforce local interest in defense cooperation is in our immediate interest as well. For Southeast Asian peoples must be encouraged to rely less on American guarantees and more on their own resources. American assistance will still of course be required, but the United States has long since shown that it will sacrifice much American blood for the security of Asian peoples. We need no longer be apologetic in suggesting that Asian manpower be the primary means of providing for Asian security.

THE PRESIDENT'S OCEANOLOGY REPORT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this week, President Johnson has released a comprehensive, important, and workmanlike report on marine science affairs in this Nation. Its 228 pages present in a clear and forceful fashion his status report on all the ocean-related matters before our Nation today. The total list of items treated is compendious, but then this country's concern with the ocean is of necessity a broad one. It includes such key questions as military security, worldwide transportation, the impact of the ocean environment on weather, food from the sea, mineral resources and recreation. To cope with all this, the United States must develop ocean technology in great profusion. The President's report indicates he intends to continue our leadership in this field which can rightly be called America's last frontier on earth.

I particularly applaud the enumeration of our national goals in marine sciences and the efforts required to meet these goals. I sense from the report that the United States is finally beginning to give meaningful coordination to its multifarious activities in marine science.

In his submission of this report to the President, the Chairman of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, is richly fulfilling his role as the Nation's No. 1 oceanologist, as never before. Despite the countless, conflicting commitments which beset him, the Vice President has mastered the complex area of his responsibility in the oceanology sector of this country. He speaks brilliantly and without notes on many details relating to the sea and should be congratulated by all Americans for his great contribution toward development of our marine resources.

The National Council's executive secretary, Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., should also be congratulated for his contribution to the Vice President's report as chairman.

President Johnson deserves special praise for setting priorities for governmental effort in the coming year. I am happy that he put at the top of his list for increased funding the sea-grant and other university programs. The Pell-Rogers Sea-Grant College Act, which I had the honor of authoring and shepherding through Congress, is becoming implemented at last. Unfortunately, the fund-

ing to date has been minimal—only \$4 million for the last 2 years in contrast to the \$20 million authorized by Congress. I urge that he request larger funding for the sea-grant college program since this is the most promising area of Government spending in terms of potential return on the investment of the taxpayer's dollar.

The President's report also reveals evidence of the statesmanlike course he is setting for relations with other nations on the subject of the seas. He continues the tone he set in July 1966, when he said:

Under no circumstances, we believe, must we ever allow the prospects of rich harvest and mineral wealth to create a new form of colonial competition among the maritime nations. We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and hold the lands under the high seas. We must ensure that the deep seas and the ocean bottoms are, and remain, the legacy of all human beings.

In a friendly spirit to all mankind, he lays out a sound international policy regarding the use of the world ocean and its riches. Continuing also in the tradition of the International Geophysical Year, which proved so successful, the President calls for intensive, cooperative exploration of the oceans. One unique idea is the concept of "ocean acres," or limiting certain ocean areas for intensive research over a period of time.

Finally, I am delighted to see reflections of my own concern over the threat of anarchy in ocean space—the seas beyond the national limits where a legal vacuum exists at present. I heartily endorse the President's call for "multilateral development of legal arrangements to prevent conflicts."

In conclusion, for the overall excellence of his messages on the seas, I applaud President Johnson.

RELUCTANT PRESIDENT

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, last Saturday, the Tucson Daily Citizen published a most perceptive written portrait entitled "Of the Reluctant President and the Strike That Won't Go Away."

The article, written by Tony Tselentis, puts into perspective the many factors that weigh in the White House's handling of the copper strike that completes its eighth month today.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF THE RELUCTANT PRESIDENT AND THE STRIKE THAT WON'T GO AWAY

(By Tony Tselentis)

This was the week that so-called "around-the-clock" talks aimed at settling the copper strike began at the White House.

And it was about time. The eight-month-old strike has damaged the economy of Arizona and other western states, not to mention the ruin it has meant for individual miners and small merchants who depend on their trade.

It was announced Thursday that the loss to the nation in metals production is about \$1 billion to date. This includes \$263 million worth of gold, silver and other copper mining byproducts.

Why did it take Washington so long to

get into the act in a serious way? And why is the act, even now, no more than a supplication to the companies and unions involved to come to terms?

President Johnson has acknowledged that the strike is weakening the U.S. dollar in foreign trade, threatening prosperity at home and leading toward a pinch in vital supplies for the armed forces in Vietnam.

Yet his actions—and let's admit it, it has been evident almost from the beginning that government force was going to be needed to budge either side from its rigid stance—have been alarmingly shy.

The President's reluctance to act is somewhat understandable in the political context. Even so, he drew the threat from the chief union negotiator, Joseph P. Molony of the Steelworkers, that if he didn't help the unions, he would lose labor support.

Molony told 500 striking copper workers in Baltimore that if "our friends in Washington" are neutral in the strike "then I'll be neutral in November."

It probably was no coincidence that the next day after Molony spoke, the President ordered the White House talks that began this week.

Yet one big unanswered question is: How much weight of the rank and file does Molony carry?

Because if President Johnson has been counting the votes of the more than 50,000 men on strike, he may be in for quite a surprise. For these men and their families have been made a pawn.

The issue at the heart of the strike deadlock is company-wide bargaining, not the amount of wages to be paid during the next three years.

The administration got its hands singed early this week on the company-wide bargaining issue. An Associated Press story on Tuesday morning reported that the President had urged union leaders to put aside at least temporarily their demands for company-wide bargaining and concentrate on the economic issues.

Before noon White House Press Secretary George Christian had rushed forth with a statement that it was "just not so" that the President had urged concentration on the economic issues.

The talks now going on at the White House between the big four producers—Kennebecott, Anaconda, Phelps Dodge and American Smelting & Refining—and the coalition of 26 unions headed by the United Steelworkers of America will not be fruitful unless there is some vigorous arm twisting by the host.

One Washington reporter attributes the poisonous mood in the nation's capital to President Johnson's habit of personalizing all problems, "seeing everything in terms of personal advantage or disadvantage." The writer referred specifically to the handling of the urban crisis and the Vietnam War; he might just as logically have referred to the handling of the copper strike.

President Johnson's conduct so far may possibly have been good politics. He would have liked to keep his hands clean in this election year.

Chances are that, not only will he have to dirty them, but with a great deal more reluctant bitterness than if he had acted earlier as the situation demanded.

A CLOSE VOTE ON THE GOLD COVER BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in today's Washington Evening Star, President Johnson is quoted as having stated that I "changed" my vote in voting for the removal of the gold cover requirement yesterday. It is true that I voted to remove the gold cover, but the President was either misquoted or la-

bored under a misunderstanding in stating that I "changed" my vote. I did not change my vote.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the article to which I have referred in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 15, 1968]

L. B. J. NOT DOWNCAST AT PARTY FOR EGAL

President Johnson did not appear downcast or depressed last night at his dinner for the Prime Minister of Somalia.

He looked tired—like a man who has had everything, the whole book, thrown at him this week. But he was smiling and definitely cheered by the passage of the administration gold bill that removes the 25 percent gold cover requirement for U.S. currency and will help check the stampede of gold buying in Europe.

He lavished praise on Sen. Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, one of the dove members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the only senator present last evening, for casting one of the two deciding votes that saved the bill.

"The vote was 39 to 37, and Sen. Pell cast the deciding vote, along with Bob Byrd who changed his vote," said Johnson, who put his arm around Nuala Pell and smilingly gave her some of the credit. She didn't even know about it, she said.

This conversation took place in the Red Room right after the dinner had ended with the two toasts of Johnson and his honor guest, Mohamed Ibrahim Egal. The President paid great tribute to the forward thinking leader of the democratic African country. In so doing he quoted an "old Muslim saying": "There are four things which can never be retrieved—the spoken word, the sped arrow, time past and the neglected opportunity. Mr. Prime Minister, you have lost no time, and neglected no opportunity, in the search for true progress for your people."

In his reply, Egal spoke of the great power of America and said: "Having seen you, Mr. President, I am going back with a more comfortable feeling that that power is in the right hands."

He said that they were trying to bring peace to all their people in Somalia, Kenya and Ethiopia. "It is not the objective of Africa to fight each other."

Johnson got another boost from the entertainer who sang after dinner. Singer Anita Bryant, before giving her stirring finale, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" to the strong accompaniment of the Marine Band, spoke of her visits to Vietnam where she has entertained the troops.

During the last three years she had been particularly aware, she said, of "how dedicated" our men there were and "how self-assured." "It overwhelmed me, and I came back a better American."

"From talking to those men I came to the conclusion that they understand a lot better than many of the folks at home," said the beautiful young woman whom Mrs. Johnson introduced as someone they had known on radio and television who became a personal friend.

Secretary of State and Mrs. Rusk were at the dinner, and he was congratulated on his brilliant performance before the Foreign Relations Committee this week.

Rep. Sam Gibbons of Florida said the committee had called the public hearings to make themselves look good but that Rusk ended up looking better than they did.

"He's the only one who made sense," said Gibbons. "The rest of them are against the war but they had no alternative."

National Democratic Chairman John Bailey, when asked what he thought of the

week's political developments, took, of course, the optimistic view.

"President Johnson will be nominated and elected," he said.

Wasn't he a little depressed and worried by the new developments?

"I am not depressed, but I always worry," he said.

He spoke enviously of all the college manpower Sen. McCarthy has for door to door canvassing.

George Woods, president of the World Bank, and Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, director of the International Monetary Fund, were there, Woods looking already gayer as the time nears for Bob McNamara to take over his job.

Kitty Carlisle, looking very handsome in a new hairdo and high-necked, long-sleeved gown, was about to have a sit-down chat in the Green Room with her old friend, George.

Mrs. Woods, who has been on the West Coast this week, will get back in time for Jane Langley's dinner party tonight.

Ambassador-designate to Italy and Mrs. Gardner Ackley said they would be en route to Italy a week from last night, if confirmed by the Senate.

Robert Massie, author of the new hit best-seller, "Nicholas and Alexander," was there with his wife. They met Mrs. Johnson at a recent party in New York.

The First Lady, looking very well in a white beaded dress and long-sleeved jacket—she needed the jacket in the chilled East Room, heard an explanation of the Pinter play, "The Homecoming," from its star, Carolyn Jones.

Mrs. Johnson said that at first she was disgusted by the characters portrayed on the stage. Then the whole thing became so extreme she began to laugh.

The President gave the newswomen his regular biweekly report on his grandson. Luci had taken Lyn to a store in Austin, and the saleswomen asked if he could walk. Lyn proceeded to walk 35 steps and when Luci clapped at his performance, he clapped, too, said the pleased grandfather.

Prime Minister Egal and his pretty, small and slender wife said goodnight about 11 o'clock, and the President retired to the second floor immediately afterward.

His greeting of the Egals at 8:05 proved he was a quick-change artist. He had left the State Department farewell party for Sandy Trowbridge at 10 minutes to 8 and he was then in business suit.

TO RENEW A NATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last week President Johnson sent to the Congress a vital message appropriately entitled "To Renew a Nation." It concerns the very survival of this Nation, its people, and its resources. In the best tradition of America's first conservationist, Theodore Roosevelt, President Johnson has called attention to the shocking facts of the poisoned and cluttered air, water, and land which are fast becoming a threat to our existence rather than support for it. Soot, smoke, and noxious gases, which are the byproducts of our industrial might, choke the air we breathe. Effluvia from myriad sources foul our lakes, rivers, estuaries, and the coastal seas to the point where fish are disappearing, vacation areas are spoiled, and pure drinking water requires more and more effort to produce. Air and water are the two most immediate and frightening problems of man's environment.

There are many more excessive noise from aircraft, construction, and ground traffic; soil ravaged by unenlightened surface-mining methods; danger to wild-

life and fish caused by ever more efficient agricultural and land management techniques; the growing nightmare of the discard of solid wastes—such as garbage and rubbish, old cars and refrigerators, slaughterhouse refuse—the disappearance of country land before the continuing expansion of villages, towns, and cities are problems that would tax Solomon's ingenuity.

President Johnson cites forthrightly the anatomy of the present, rapid disintegration of our sustaining environment. He suggests energetic, sensible steps to achieve control before it is too late.

I applaud his effective approach to the timely subject of conservation and urge my colleagues to support the President's program.

In closing, I am glad to note that this message mentions the importance of the sea-grant college program in America's move toward proper use of its marine resources. Still, I regret that the President's endorsement of this program, which I authored in the Congress, is not backed up by a more vigorous support. My own understanding is that meaningful continuation of this program would require a minimum of \$10 million for the coming fiscal year.

Yet, of a \$20 million authorization to launch the program during its first 2 years, the administration asked only \$4 million; and after his eloquent words in his conservation message, the President calls for only \$6 million.

This program is designed to train people and develop technology to speed America's ability to tap the riches of the sea. Therefore, it holds promise of financial and material return on the Government's investments. It merits more support that the President is requesting if it is to achieve its potential benefit to the Nation.

THE WASHINGTON POST IS IN ERROR

Mr. FANNIN, Mr. President, on March 9, 1968, the Washington Post published an article on page A-7 dealing with the consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of legislation to broaden the enforcement powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—EEOC.

This unsigned article is substantially in error. It presents a false representation of many of the facts surrounding this issue, and it makes serious and fallacious charges against me which should be set straight. I shall point out these errors and shall call the Senate's attention to a possible violation of the rules of one of its committees, and hope to set the record straight. But it would not be necessary to take the Senate's time, or the space in the official RECORD, to do this if the Post were willing to correct its own mistakes.

Although the Washington Post publicly prides itself on accuracy, responsibility, and objectivity, I offer this first-hand report of the series of events following publication of this story:

On Monday morning March 11 after the story appeared on Saturday, my office contacted the editorial offices of the

Post and asked to talk with the person responsible for the "Letters to the Editor" column. After some conversation, it was developed that he does not come in on Mondays; and besides, that portion of the editorial page had already been made up. My staff pointed out that there must be some way to have a correction touching a Saturday story made before the following Wednesday, and was finally advised by a secretary to send the letter over, and the newspaper would see what could be done with it.

My letter, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD, was hand-delivered by a member of my staff on Monday afternoon. It still has not appeared in the pages of the Post. Subsequent telephone calls received assurances that the letter would be printed, but it has not been. The Post's editorial representative said my letter made some allegations and that he wanted time to "check into the facts of the matter" before he printed it. That is an admirable procedure, and I commend him for checking the facts of a news story before it is printed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, and my further remarks to follow it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hiring Bill Bottled Up 6 Months

Senate conservatives are seeking to emasculate a bill that would put teeth in the Administration's program to eliminate discriminatory hiring practices by Government contractors.

A source close to the Senate Labor and Education Committee said "a sort of a rolling filibuster" has bottled up the bill in Committee for the past six months.

Meanwhile, a series of amendments by Sen. Paul J. Fannin (R-Ariz.) would "gut enforcement" of the proposed measure, he said.

Although the amendments have met with little success thus far, the informant explained, they are "quite sophisticated."

"They are offered slowly and with lengthy speeches and the intent is apparently to beguile other Committee members into accepting the amendments as innocuous," he said.

The bill would empower the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to issue orders requiring companies and unions involved in government contracts to "cease and desist" from discriminatory employment practices. It would give the Commission enforcement powers similar to those exercised by the National Labor Relations Board against unfair labor practices.

The Commission's operation is presently limited to persuasion and conciliation although it can recommend certain cases to the Justice Department for prosecution.

Typical of the Fannin amendments was one, beaten 11 to 3, which would have taken from the Commission the power to decide what constitutes discriminatory hiring and give it to the courts.

Fannin's proposals are supported down the line in Committee by Chairman Lister Hill (D-Ala.) and Sen. George Murphy (R-Calif.), the source said. Part of the time Senators Peter H. Dominick (R-Colo.), Winston L. Prouty (R-Vt.) and Robert P. Griffin (R-Mich.) vote with them, he added.

Mr. FANNIN, Mr. President, the first sentence contains a mistake.

Describing the pending legislation as applying to Government contractors is

in error. The legislation (S. 1308) will apply to every business affecting commerce hiring 25 persons or more. This is a substantial error of fact.

The second sentence contains a mistake and a questionable interpretation. The committee to which this story apparently refers is the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. There is no Labor and Education Committee. A small but perhaps indicative mistake. Also my "rolling filibuster," as it is colorfully described, is simply an attempt to modify the legislation into an instrument that is within the bounds of the Constitution and consistent with the powers granted other agencies of this type. Even some of the bill's supporters have privately admitted that the legislation is poorly drawn but they must go along because of administration pressure. Of course, I recognize that it is within the realm of a responsible reporter to place certain interpretations on the facts as he sees them. These are commonly called editorials rather than presented as news reports.

Further down in the story, one of my amendments is described erroneously as removing "from the Commission the power to decide what constitutes discriminatory hiring and give it to the courts." This is not correct.

The man who was eavesdropping on the executive session of the committee, and reports a vote and other matters taken in executive session, evidently is trying to describe my amendment which would have preserved the Commission's authority but would have given the courts the power to fashion the remedy; a perfectly fair approach to the problem it seems to me and hardly to be characterized as trying to "gut" the bill.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should note the willingness of the Washington Post to print what amounts to confidential information developed within the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare while at the same time displaying a great reluctance to correct its own news columns.

Perhaps some of the reluctance can be understood because of one of the paragraphs in my letter, in which I state:

If the EEOC should apply the same standards to the writing and editorial staff of the Washington Post that they recently did to the New York Times I believe you would be found falling far short of achieving a satisfactory mark in racial balance. Recent EEOC hearings in New York found the Times although attempting to practice what we preach woefully lacking in its attempt to hire reporters and writers from nonwhite minority groups when compared with the racial makeup of the community.

Mr. President, in making this statement, I was only utilizing information from the Post's own news pages of Monday, January 22, 1968, page A-6, which developed that although New York has a Negro and Puerto Rican population percentage of 28 percent, the Times has "three Negro reporters out of a staff of 200, no Puerto Rican reporters or officials whatsoever, and one Negro out of 220 employees at the managerial level." Does the Post better that record with respect to the racial makeup of Washington?

I happen to think that this approach to employment practice is wrong, and I

say so in my letter. In fact, it is specifically forbidden in the 1964 Civil Rights Act creating the EEOC. Still EEOC officials consistently cite this kind of information if we are to believe the news pages of the Washington Post.

I know that little is to be gained when an elected official undertakes to argue with a newspaper, and this is all that I intend to say about this matter. I just want to set the record straight.

My argument is not so much with the Post and its editorial viewpoint. The Post is simply the victim of a great deal of softheaded thinking abroad in the land today. Its main crime is in automatically disseminating this attitude without examining the inconsistency of its own position.

My main disagreement is with those who think that we can pass laws to make men instantly prosperous or virtuous or fairminded. The equal employment problem is one that demands voluntary cooperation and mutual effort. Those who set one side against the other in a legal battle do a distinct disservice.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the editor of the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 11, 1968.

The EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On Saturday last (March 9, page A-7), you carried an unsigned story concerning proposed legislation to broaden the scope and powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

The story is substantially in error and quite false in the impression it presents. For example, in the first paragraph the bill is described as eliminating "discriminatory hiring practices by Government contractors." This legislation as it stands now will apply to every business hiring 25 people or more, not just Government contractors. Further, in the story you describe one of my "typical amendments" as one which would take "from the Commission the power to decide what constitutes discriminatory hiring practices and give it to the courts." This is not correct. The amendment would have preserved the Commission's authority but would have given the courts the power to fashion the remedy.

May I say that I would have been glad to correct these errors if your "source" had checked with me but apparently you did not feel that was necessary. I would not, however, have revealed the information contained in the story that was developed in executive session of the Committee. Executive sessions are for the purpose of working out the details of pending legislation, are conducted on a rather informal basis and are supposed to allow committee members a free opportunity to discuss the "pros" and "cons" of legislation without being misunderstood. Your news source has violated those ground rules.

I will be happy to discuss this legislation at length with you or your writers because I think it has broad implications for every man and woman who expects to hold a job as well as for every employer and union. As an example: If the EEOC should apply the same standards to the writing and editorial staff of the Washington Post that they recently did to the New York Times, I believe you would be found falling far short of achieving a satisfactory mark in racial balance. Recent EEOC hearings in New York found the Times, although attempting to "practice what we preach" woefully lacking

in its attempt to hire reporters and writers from non-white minority groups when compared with the racial makeup of the community.

If the EEOC gets the "cease and desist" power it wants, it is conceivable that it could order you to take "affirmative action" calculated to achieve a better racial balance of your writing and editorial staff. This could include specified changes in your hiring, promotional and seniority systems throughout your organization. I happen to believe that a newspaper editor has the right, indeed the obligation, to impose standards other than race on the composition of his staff. That is what I am striving for. I welcome your support.

Sincerely,

PAUL FANNIN, U.S. Senator.

REFINEMENT OF INCOME LIMITATIONS CONTAINED IN H.R. 12555 WILL PREVENT HARDSHIP ON VETERANS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend the Senate Finance Committee on its work on H.R. 12555, the bill we passed on Monday, March 11, to improve income limitations on non-service-connected veterans' pensions. This is wise and humane legislation, and I am pleased that it has passed both Houses and has gone to the President for his signature.

My interest in this measure stems not only from my representation of West Virginia veterans and their survivors who would have suffered hardship if this legislation had not been passed, but also from my service as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Approximately 1 year ago, our subcommittee held a series of hearings on the subject, "Reduction of Retirement Benefits Due to Social Security Increases." There was much testimony during these hearings on the severe reductions in veterans' non-service-connected pensions and related benefits which resulted in 1965 when the social security benefits enacted that year forced many of them over income limits. We were keenly conscious of the danger that the social security increases of 1967 would have the same effect if protective legislation is not enacted.

In our report on this subject, we recommended as the best long-range solution of this problem that there be a refinement of income limits, which is the approach of the bill we passed on Monday, H.R. 12555. This measure substitutes 18 income limits to measure a veteran's pension need for the three income limits in the present law. This means that each time an income limit is exceeded there will be a much smaller loss of his pension than before passage of the bill. Thus, a social security increase which forces a veteran over income limits will result in a much smaller pension loss than before. There will be very few cases where the veteran will suffer a greater pension loss than the amount of his social security increase, and such net losses will be negligible. I would have preferred that even those few cases be prevented also, and we cannot demand perfection. I recognize this as perhaps the best legislation we can hope for under the circumstances.

The dominant reason for the legisla-

tion is the need to prevent hardship on veterans and their survivors resulting from the recently enacted social security increase. But there will also be another significant improvement resulting from the bill's enactment. Present law penalizes a veteran or the survivor of a veteran who attempts by his or her own efforts to improve his or her nonpension income and eventually to work his or her way to the point where he or she no longer needs a pension and no longer qualifies for one. Such a veteran or survivor can effect a slight improvement in nonpension income only to find that it forces him or her into a new income bracket, resulting in a pension loss greater than the improvement in nonpension income which has resulted from his or her efforts. This penalizes and discourages self-help efforts and rewards and encourages apathy and helplessness. If the President signs H.R. 12555 into law, its refined income limits will reverse this trend and will stimulate self-help efforts of those who receive pension benefits and dependency and indemnity compensation.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am gratified that this meritorious legislation has passed both Houses and the President, I trust, will soon sign it into law.

H.R. 12555

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to express my satisfaction as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging that both Houses have now passed H.R. 12555 and sent it to the President for his signature. Senators on the Special Committee on Aging have been aware of the possibility that recently enacted social security increases could result in reductions in overall retirement incomes of some veterans and their survivors if Congress had not acted promptly to forestall that unfortunate result. Under the able leadership of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], our Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes last year thoroughly studied this problem and formally recommended the approach represented by the bill we have just passed, H.R. 12555. Our favorable action on this bill will prevent unfortunate consequences for many elderly Americans which I am certain no one in Congress intended when we approved the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

INTERVIEW ON THE "TODAY" SHOW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a transcript of an interview of Senators MONDALE and BYRD of West Virginia on the "Today" show, March 5, 1968.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS BYRD AND MONDALE INTERVIEWED ON THE "TODAY" SHOW, MARCH 5, 1968

HUGH DOWNS. The Senate is moving into the final phase of considering new civil rights legislation. And yesterday, after six and a half weeks of debate, the Senate did what it's done before only twice on civil rights issues, voted to limit debate. And now a final vote

may come up later this week, or early next week.

Perhaps, the most controversial of the new proposals is the ban on discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

And this morning we have as our guests two Democratic senators much involved in this issue, and holding different viewpoints on it.

Walter Mondale of Minnesota, and Robert Byrd of West Virginia are in our Washington studio now with NBC News Correspondent Herb Kaplow. Gentlemen.

Mr. KAPLOW. Good morning, Hugh.

Senator Mondale was one of the main forces behind what is called the fair housing proposal, the open housing proposal, which you just mentioned a moment or so ago in a broader sense.

Senator Mondale, how can the Federal Government tell people whom to sell to?

Senator MONDALE. It doesn't do that, and this is one of the big misunderstandings surrounding fair housing. The truth of it is that fair housing permits an owner to do virtually everything with his property he could do before. He can insist on the best price. He can sell it to his best friend. He can give it to his wife. He can decide any—in any personal way he wants to how he sells the house, or how he doesn't sell it. There's only one thing he can't do, if he sells through a broker, and that is to refuse solely on the ground that—the buyer to whom he would otherwise sell is a Negro. And we—that's all it involves.

Mr. KAPLOW. Well, what legal basis is there for the government to say a man cannot choose not to sell to a Negro?

Senator MONDALE. Well, there is plenty of legal ground, the 14th Amendment, the commerce clause. There are some 24 states now that have fair housing laws, including my own state. Over 80 municipalities—

Mr. KAPLOW. Are they all based on the commerce clause, more or less?

Senator MONDALE. It depends on the environment.

Mr. KAPLOW. Then can't the commerce clause be extended to almost anything?

Senator MONDALE. That is correct. And this is true of the 14th Amendment. The Attorney General of the United States, a distinguished panel of deans of law schools, and legal scholars throughout the country are almost unanimous that the legal reach of this—this bill is fully Constitutional and fully legal.

Mr. KAPLOW. Well, I know that Senator Byrd here takes a strongly different view.

Senator BYRD. Yes, I think that under the 14th Amendment, a state cannot deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. But an individual is not barred from discrimination. The Constitution doesn't bar the individual from discriminating.

I believe that this is better denominated a forced housing law. I'm for fair housing. That's what we have now—

Mr. KAPLOW. What do you mean—

Senator BYRD. But fair housing is a two way street. But this is called a fair housing bill. I maintain that that's the sugar coating on a forced housing bill, because the element of government compulsion enters the picture.

Mr. KAPLOW. What do you mean we have a fair housing bill now?

Senator BYRD. I didn't mean to say we had a fair housing bill. I meant to say that we have fair housing now.

Mr. KAPLOW. You mean a man may choose not to sell to a Negro, and that's considered fair?

Senator BYRD. I think it is, because he owns the property. I think that property rights constitute a basic human right, and this is a right that existed long before the Constitution of the United States was ever written, long before the Magna Carta was written.

Mr. KAPLOW. I think you're coming up right—right to the crucial point here. You

talk about property rights and then you talk about equal rights, I suppose. How do you reconcile these two?

Senator BYRD. Well, I think a man has the right, of course, to buy wherever he wishes. He has that right now. We don't have to legislate to give him that right.

Mr. KAPLOW. But supposing they won't sell to him because he's Negro?

Senator BYRD. But the individual who owns the property also has a right to refuse to sell, or to lease, or to rent, if he so wishes.

Mr. KAPLOW. Well, how do you resolve that, if a man has—can't buy because he's a Negro?

Senator BYRD. Well, he can buy somewhere else. I want him to have decent housing. But he doesn't have to take away the rights of the individual who already owns the property, in order to have decent housing.

I maintain he has no legal right, he has no Constitutional right, he has no natural right, no natural claim, no legal claim upon that property. The individual who owns the property has the legal claim upon it.

And if the so-called fair housing bill is passed, this gives the prospective buyer rights that are superior to those of the individual who has a legal claim upon the property. And I think this is forced housing. I don't think this is fair housing at all.

Senator MONDALE. Of course, I think the only forced housing there is in the United States today are the growing patterns of racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing, which has literally compressed millions of Negroes into the rotting cores of the central cities of our country. That's the only force that I know of.

And secondly, when my good friend Senator Byrd describes the meaning of my amendment, and Senator Dirksen's amendment, I sometimes wonder whether we're talking about the same thing.

Mr. KAPLOW. Well, you're—

Senator MONDALE. We're not granting any rights, except we're denying to a seller, who sells through a broker, the right to refuse solely on the ground of race—not to sell to a person who would otherwise be the buyer. He can insist on the highest price. He can decide how he wants to sell it anyway he wants to. He can give it away. He can do anything he can do now. The only one thing he can't do when he uses a broker is refuse solely on the grounds of race—and even there the complainant has the burden of proof.

And this is—this kind of restriction on property is as old as property law. It's not—nothing new. Since almost the beginning of common law, really, in the Bible itself, it's been recognized that property rights have to be adjusted toward the needed social purposes of a community.

We've seen that from the beginning. We saw it in common law. There were all kinds of restrictions on conveyances. We have zoning restrictions, building codes, set back requirements, payments of special assessments. It's been known for years. Things that can be done to property . . .

Mr. KAPLOW. And what is the legal basis for those?

Senator MONDALE. Well, it's just a simple thing that property rights have to be adjusted to the social needs of the community. And this is certainly true with this problem.

The truth of it is today that we are a much sicker society than we will admit. As the riot commission pointed out, we're becoming two nations, separate and unequal. This is a social problem that's as great as any this nation has ever faced.

I happen to think that racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing is immoral. But I also believe that unless we can remove this curse from American society, unless it's possible for a Negro, who meets the rules of the game—he finds his job—he earns his income—he achieves in white society, and then is able to buy a house like

everybody else—unless we can remove this insult from American life, we're going to contribute to the frustration, and the rage, and the rightful criticism of decent Americans who happen to be colored—that pinned unfairly in—into these ghettos. And I don't blame them one single bit.

Mr. KAPLOW. Well, we're getting aside from—from whatever moral question is involved. We're trying to figure out the legal—

Senator MONDALE. Yes, but it's that social policy—it's that social need which gives us more than enough reason to prohibit discrimination in the rental and sale of housing.

There is no legal problem here. I don't know of a single, responsible, legal scholar in this country who argues any longer that there's a legal problem with this civil rights act.

Now, I would like to bring up one other point—

Mr. KAPLOW. I mean Senator Byrd argues—

Senator MONDALE. That's right, but everything—they always argue that every time we want to pass a civil rights act. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were always presented with the same argument, you can't do it; it's illegal. America Constitutionally is impotent to solve racism in American society. Every time we disregarded their advice, and every time the Supreme Court upheld these things to be Constitutional.

The notion that the American Government is powerless to remove something as outrageous, and immoral, and as dangerous as racism in the rental and sale of housing is just beyond belief.

Senator BYRD. Now, my distinguished colleague has talked about the Bible. Jesus, in the parable of the laborers in the vineyards, says, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" He was talking about his own property. And I maintain that it's lawful for the property owner to do what he will with his own. That's the whole crux of this—

Mr. KAPLOW. Now, what about—

Senator BYRD. Now, let me have equal time with Senator Mondale.

Mr. KAPLOW. We're starting with the Bible. It may take us a while to get back here, but go ahead.

Senator BYRD. Senator Mondale introduced that element.

Secondly, I maintain that the very conception of property is exclusiveness, the right of exclusive possession, enjoyment, and disposition. And whenever we take away these rights, we take away all that is property. And if you take away any of them, or if you introduce any participation in any of them, you take away the property by that extent.

Now, Senator Mondale mentioned the riot Commission report. I read the summary of the riot commission's report. It has some good recommendations in it. But I think it's a good one sided experiment in superficiality. It places the blame for the race riots, the recent riots, on the attitudes and behavior of white people. And, I think, this is partially true. But I don't—I feel like Edmund Burke must have felt when he said, "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." I don't think anybody can indict an entire race. And as I read the summary of the report, that's precisely what the report does. It indicts the white race.

Mr. KAPLOW. What would you take from the report as a good basis on which to start, or to continue trying to solve this problem?

Senator BYRD. Well, I—

Mr. KAPLOW. Obviously you wouldn't go for the recommendation for a national open housing law, because that's what we're here talking of this morning.

Senator BYRD. As I said a moment ago, I think every individual in the country should

have an opportunity to secure decent housing. And I don't mean by this that one has to live in an interracial neighborhood to have decent housing.

I think if the property owner wants to sell to a Negro, if the property owner is white, that's all right. If a Negro property owner wants to sell to a white man, that's his business. He pays the taxes on his property. He pays the fire insurance on it. He paid for the property. He puts the new roof on it. He paints it every two or three years. If he's a gentle and wants to sell to a Jew, or if he is of Jewish faith, and wishes to sell to a gentle, that's his business.

But I maintain that we have no business bringing the Federal Government into the equation, and, thereby bringing government compulsion into the situation.

Mr. KAPLOW. Didn't you, in effect, lose this argument with respect to the public accommodation provision a couple of years ago?

Senator BYRD. Yes, yes.

And, as Senator Mondale has stated, the Supreme Court of the United States has from time to time upheld many of these—what I would call innovations. But here again I would probably differ with the Senator, when you start discussing the Supreme Court of the United States as it is—as its membership is presently [constituted].

Mr. KAPLOW. Senator Mondale, there are—there's something like 90 provisions—amendments being considered right now. You disposed of some yesterday. Well, how do you think this thing is realistically going to come out, the open housing bill?

Senator MONDALE. I think we're going to adopt a good fair housing bill. Two thirds of the Senate voted at—on such a bill yesterday. We had a strong margin in favor of a fair housing bill on every vote we've had.

I think the vast majority of the Senate, Democratic and Republican, realize we've got to remove this curse from American society. It must be done. And I think we're going to do it.

Mr. KAPLOW. Senator Byrd.

Senator BYRD. Well, I hope that whatever bill is finally enacted will not contain a so called fair housing provision. I have said that I would vote for the bill, if there were no fair housing provisions.

I don't agree with people who believe that simply because this is an election year we have to have another so called civil rights bill. I'm for civil rights. But any bill that bears the title of civil rights automatically clothes itself with an aura of respectability that makes it difficult to oppose it.

And I'm not one of those who believe that we have to pass this bill or any other bill, in order to forestall riots. I believe that rioters should be treated as rioters, and that the law should be enforced.

Mr. KAPLOW. Thank you, gentlemen, for coming by here this morning, and we'll be watching what you do in a week—a couple of weeks ahead on this matter.

Now back to Today in New York.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GOLD CRISIS AND THE SURCHARGE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, with the biggest international money crisis since the thirties facing the world—and with the United States holding the key to the situation—this Nation cannot afford to sit quietly and take stock. We must act.

There are two basic problems which result in the gold outflow, which in turn creates the present international monetary crisis. The first is the fact that inflation remains uncontrolled here in the United States, and this undermines confidence in the stability of the dollar. The second is that the balance-of-payments situation worsens every day.

I suggest that two remedies be applied immediately: First, the Congress should pass the 10-percent surcharge which the President has recommended, and which would help put a brake on rising costs; and, second, the administration should bring home from Western Europe as soon as possible four U.S. Army divisions permanently stationed there. This is the quickest way I know of to cut down U.S. spending overseas, and thus to reduce the gap in the balance of payments.

The London financial experts, trying yesterday to assess what had caused the wild speculation on the London gold market, mentioned most often the fact that Europe was worried about uncontrolled inflation in the United States, and the unwillingness of the Congress to pass the surcharge or do anything else to control it.

On November 9 of last year I made a speech on the Senate floor in which I urged my colleagues not to adjourn the session without making sure that, and I quote, "we understood what is being said about the economic consequences of failure to adopt the surcharge, and that we had given full weight to these consequences."

I then reviewed in some detail the case the administration had made for the surcharge and came to the conclusion that a 10-percent surcharge would take far less out of the pocket of the average American citizen than would uncontrolled inflation. I said furthermore:

Failure to adopt the surcharge will lead to a worsening of our balance-of-payments position. The adverse effect on balance of payments is a natural consequence of increased inflationary pressures. Excessive demand for goods and services drives up both costs and prices. The excessive growth of domestic markets and the higher prices attract imports, while, at the same time, rising domestic costs make our exports less attractive to foreign buyers. Supporters of the tax surcharge warn that our trade balance is becoming less favorable, and the confidence of the world's financial community in the dollar can only be impaired.

Mr. President, I am disappointed that the Senate Finance Committee decided yesterday, by a margin of only one vote,

not to amend the Tax Adjustment Act—H.R. 15414—to include the surcharge. This act, which continues existing excise tax rates on communication services and automobiles, and which would expedite payments of estimated tax by corporations, is a natural vehicle for immediate action on the surcharge. If the House is unwilling to move on this important piece of legislation, the Senate must. I shall support an effort to amend the bill on the Senate floor to include the surcharge.

Nor can we wait any longer to make a substantial reduction of U.S. forces permanently stationed in Europe. I suggest the return of four divisions, and their supporting units. By bringing them and their dependents home we could save hundreds of millions of dollars.

There is no question in my mind that we can afford to do this from both a military and security point of view. Although only one Army division would remain, I feel this force would be sufficient. Twenty years ago, at the time we pledged large contingents of American Armed Forces to Europe, including air and naval units, our NATO partners were not in a condition, either militarily or economically, to maintain forces large enough to resist aggression if it came.

However, the situation has greatly changed. Our European allies are in a sound financial condition, and can well afford to assume a larger burden of the financing and staffing of forces to police the peace. They have never, and they are not now, bearing their fair and equitable share of the cost in either men or money.

All realists know, also, that the political climate has changed in Europe in the past 20 years. Relations between Eastern and Western Europe have greatly improved. Tensions have lessened. There is an increasing two-way flow of trade, an increasing cultural and scientific exchange, an increasing number of Western Europeans visiting the countries behind the Iron Curtain, and of those citizens coming west. The threat of communism to the world is still there, but it is not as militant or menacing.

Also, it is very clear that with the changing technology of modern warfare, large contingents of foot soldiers are no longer as necessary as they once were. Modern conventional wars are waged by air, with bombers often based some distance from their targets. By removing troops on the spot in Europe we would not jeopardize our ability to meet our commitments to NATO, or jeopardize in any way our own security. Last year we flew an entire division to Europe in 24 hours.

The distinguished majority leader of the Senate [Mr. MANSFIELD] introduced Senate Resolution 49 last year, which provides that it is the sense of the Senate that a substantial reduction be made in U.S. forces in Europe, and the resolution was cosponsored by 43 other Members, myself among them. I think this is a strong indication of Senate sentiment.

Mr. President, nothing is more pressing at this time than dealing quickly and effectively with the international gold crisis. There is some action that only the administration, and the leaders

of other nations, can take. But I have mentioned two specific steps which the U.S. Senate can and should take, and we should take them now.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE EXPENDITURES

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 938, Senate Resolution 208.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 208) to authorize the Committee on Finance to expend \$10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 208) was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninetieth Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 946, Senate Resolution 228.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 228) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I notice that in 1966 this committee

operated with \$27,766.04, and in 1967 it operated with \$29,478. Now, the request is for \$50,000 under the pending resolution.

I am wondering if there is any explanation as to why the amount is practically doubled.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Delaware, the amount of \$29,478.91 was for 11 months. The last month is usually one of the heaviest months. In connection with all of these committees we find that all they are asking for is last year's amount.

With respect to what they asked for and what they used, they do not usually use all they ask for because they turn back an amount or do not take it out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, that may be true, but at a time when we are having difficulty with the budget I think it is well to hold the amount down as much as possible, just as we are going to make every effort to hold expenditures down in the executive branch.

While it is true that this is compared with but 11 months last year, in 1968 there will be only 11 months involved. One month of 1968 has been paid. One would get to the same answer on a calendar basis.

Mr. President, I move that on page 2, line 21, the figure "\$50,000" be stricken and that the figure "\$30,000" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes an amendment on page 2, line 21, strike the numeral and insert "\$30,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] appeared before the full committee to justify the amount. I think very much that he should be given what was authorized by the full Committee on Rules and Administration which heard the Senator from New Mexico. Other members of his staff asked for the money. I have to oppose the reduction asked by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in looking at the information list before us, I notice that the amount asked by this committee is one of the smallest figures to appear of any committee in the Senate. If that is really the case, it seems to me that instead of pointing the finger of scorn at the committee, we should applaud it for asking for less money than any other committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I might also point out that in the asking this year, it takes into consideration the increase in salaries voted last year. There is possibly another increase for this fiscal year. That was also taken into consideration. But it is one of the smallest askings of any major committee, and I do not believe it is excessive at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from North Carolina points out that there has been an increase in salaries.

That is correct, but the salaries were not increased 90 percent. They are asking about an 85- to a 90-percent increase. I want to be reasonable. Would the Senator from North Carolina go along and change that figure to \$32,000? That would more than take care of any increase in salaries and would give them a little more than they had last year.

Mr. President, I so modify my amendment to make it \$32,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is the same amount they had last year, which they did not use. I want to say, at the beginning of the discussion on all these resolutions, that every single one of them was cleared and justified in their asking. They were laid down before the committee. Of the total askings, the committee cut nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ million. I think the committee did a very good job in trimming it as much as it could. We did not take upon ourselves the duty of telling the chairman of the committee that he did not need this secretary or that secretary. We did not do that. We take it for granted that the chairman of the committee knows what he needs and does not ask for more than he needs. In every case where the money is not used, being as frugal as they can, the money is turned in or not used, as is the case right here. I would have to oppose any reduction in the asking amounts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not singling this one out. I notice that in many of the resolutions they are asking for substantially more than they had last year. We are going to have great difficulty in holding the line on the 1968 budget. I happen to be one who thinks that we will have to roll back on budget requests and place a ceiling on expenditures so far as the executive branch is concerned.

Likewise, I feel that if we in Congress, to impress the executive branch with the need to curtail its expenditures, should live by our own rules and try to institute some savings. If we are going to take this package of resolutions as presented to us we will be adding a total on an average of about 40 to 50 percent more than was used or needed by the same committees last year. If we are going to start this 40- to 50-percent increase here in Congress we will not get very far in telling the executive branch what to do, and if we do not get started telling the executive branch to curtail its expenditures we will continue to be in difficulty so far as the financial picture in this country is concerned. In fact, perhaps I should not say we will be, because we are in difficulty now. We are already confronted with an international crisis so far as the American dollar is concerned.

I think that Congress, and the Senate in particular, must start to live by the rules we are laying down for the executive branch. Let us give substance to the many speeches we are hearing.

I insist on the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am willing to proceed to a vote. This particular committee, I wish to emphasize, has been under excellent management by the Senator from New Mexico. I do not suggest for a moment that there would be any money wasted by the Senator.

The point I am making is that we are going to have to make a start somewhere on this \$178 billion of proposed expenditures if we are going to even approach any semblance of fiscal responsibility as far as this Government is concerned. In seeking that we are asking the executive departments to roll back on their planned expenditures. Therefore, I feel very strongly that we in Congress must demonstrate that we are willing to live by our own rules.

In this case \$27,766.04 was expended in 1966 and \$29,478.91 in 1967. The resolution asks for \$50,000, but the amendment would roll that figure back to \$32,000.

I believe that is reasonable. I want to be reasonable with the Senator from New Mexico and with others. There is nothing personal here. The same effort and suggestions will be made in other cases where similar increases are involved.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I believe that the suggestion that we should make a start somewhere should not apply to this committee, because it has made a start. When I assumed the chairmanship of the committee, the budget for these outside investigation expenditures was \$135,000. As the Rules Committee knows, I cut it down to \$50,000 in 2 years. We do not spend extra money. We do have to have some for slight expenditures.

I believe we have it pretty well pinned down. We spent last year \$31,183.87. That is \$3,400 more than we spent the year before, due to pay increases. We have had no increases in staff, or anything of that nature. The clerk of the committee himself knows that we have cut this thing, item by item, as far as we could. I simply hope the Senate will not try to cut it further.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to point out one thing. In the first session of the 88th Congress, there was authorized for this activity \$82,500. They expended only \$32,287.69. For the second session, there was authorized \$88,500, and expended \$76,229.38, which is considerably more than they are asking for this year.

In the 89th Congress, first session, they asked for \$95,000, and spent \$38,618.85; and in the second session, they asked for \$50,000, and spent \$27,766.04.

This year they are asking for \$50,000, which is considerably less than they have requested in any of the years above, except for the second session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I also wish to state that when we had the investigation of the accident in Florida, where the astronauts were killed, we were frequently urged to spend, for the investigation, more than \$250,000. But we did not spend anything like that at all.

It is very easy to make such expenditures. But in their good judgment, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and his staff recommended that we spend only a small amount of money, and we did, all the way through.

I believe this is a very poor time to cut this request.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I would object to the cutting of this resolution, because I think the Committee on Rules has taken all the evidence, as stated by the chairman and his staff, and I believe the amount asked for should be allotted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE],

the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCLELLAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 42, as follows:

[No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—11

Alken
Baker

Dominick
Ellender

Hatfield
Miller

Morton Mundt	Proxmire Thurmond	Williams, Del.
NAYS—42		
Anderson	Ervin	Metcalf
Bartlett	Fannin	Montoya
Bennett	Fong	Moss
Brewster	Gruening	Pearson
Brooke	Hart	Randolph
Burdick	Hayden	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Smith
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Sparkman
Cannon	Jackson	Spong
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Curtis	Long, La.	Yarborough
Dirksen	McGovern	Young, N. Dak.
Dodd	McIntyre	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—47

Allott	Holland	Morse
Bayh	Hollings	Murphy
Bible	Hruska	Muskie
Boggs	Javits	Nelson
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Church	Kuchel	Percy
Clark	Lausche	Prouty
Eastland	Long, Mo.	Russell
Fulbright	Magnuson	Scott
Gore	Mansfield	Smathers
Griffin	McCarthy	Talmadge
Hansen	McClellan	Tower
Harris	McGee	Tydings
Hartke	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Hickenlooper	Monroney	

So the modified amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 228

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than \$2,300 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO REORGANIZATIONS IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 954, Senate Resolution 214.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 214) to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$130,000" and insert "\$115,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, and to consider reorganizations proposed therein.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, this resolution is being taken up out of order so that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] may keep an urgent engagement.

In this resolution, \$130,000 was requested, and the committee cut the amount to \$115,000. I ask that the resolution be agreed to with the amount of \$115,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-

tion is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The amendment was agreed to. Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in 1965 the committee used \$72,854.42; in 1966 it used \$112,316.22; and last year it used \$100,523.57. I wonder why the committee needs a 15-percent increase this year.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield to the chairman of the committee and ask him to explain.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, last year we actually expended \$108,000. The automatic pay increases effective July 1, 1968, and administrative items relating to the pay raise will require an additional \$10,000.

In addition, the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization now has two sets of hearings underway. One hearing deals with creating a blue-ribbon commission to evaluate the entire organization of the executive branch. One of the bills is that of Senator PEARSON. The other is mine. Some 60 Senators are co-sponsors of these measures.

We have already held 5 days of hearings. We expect to hold more hearings.

It is the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Kansas and myself that this proposal could save untold millions of dollars for the Federal Government.

In addition, we have also begun hearings on S. 2865, which would require automobile manufacturers to specify the prices of items of safety equipment sold to the public.

We are now making plans to go into the entire organization of health care in the United States, beginning in April. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that no item in America has skyrocketed in cost as has health care. At present, the Federal Government is expending some \$15 billion in health care.

Some 14 different Government agencies are involved in expending approximately \$15 billion. From my experience as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and my experience in the Senate, my belief is that we could save a considerable amount of money.

In addition, the administration has already sent up four reorganization plans—reorganization in the field of transportation, reorganization in the District of Columbia, and reorganization in the field of narcotics. Other reorganizations are pending.

Our committee has always been very conscientious and hardworking, and we expect to be busier this year than ever. We are hewing to the line, and are not asking for more money than we have had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 214), as amended, was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration

of unobjected to measures on the calendar, under rule VIII, and that they be considered in sequence, beginning with Calendar No. 947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STUDY OF JURISDICTION OF SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

The resolution (S. Res. 225) to make a study of all matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 225

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) common defense generally;
- (2) the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally;
- (3) soldiers' and sailors' homes;
- (4) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;
- (5) selective service;
- (6) size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force;
- (7) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;
- (8) ammunition depots;
- (9) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;
- (10) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;
- (11) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense; and
- (12) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The resolution (S. Res. 209) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, and to provide additional funds therefor, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$145,000" and insert "\$120,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 209

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) banking and currency generally;
- (2) financial aid to commerce and industry;
- (3) deposit insurance;
- (4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;
- (5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;
- (6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;
- (7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;
- (8) securities and exchange regulations;
- (9) credit problems of small business; and
- (10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this proposal requests an increase of approximately 20 to 25 percent. Again, I do not believe it can be justified at this time, but if it can I should like an explanation as to why it is necessary.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I note that in 1963 this committee operated with \$77,465, in 1964 with \$73,800, in 1965 with \$100,689, in 1966 with \$103,119, and in 1967 with \$92,860; this year they request \$120,000. Why is there such an increase?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The principal increase is occasioned by the increase in salaries. I believe that would total approximately \$9,000 or \$10,000. That is the principal increase.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not amount to that much.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, not that much. Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Approximately \$4,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought it was a little more than that. That is the principal increase.

In the request we made, which was \$145,000, we asked permission to employ an economist and a clerical assistant. The Rules Committee apparently decided we could get along with what we have. I believe we need an economist, but we probably can wait.

I am perfectly willing to accept the \$120,000, as proposed by the Rules Committee. I believe we should have that amount.

Let me call attention to the fact that we turned in \$9,377.35 from the amount we had last year. I do not believe any committee has conducted its affairs with more frugality than has this committee. I believe the Senator will note that every year the committee turned in the remainder. It is not that we try to hew exactly to the cent, because we never know when something will come up. After all, the Committee on Banking and Currency is charged with supervisory jurisdiction over many agencies and many activities.

I assure the Senator that we will operate with the usual frugality.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not question that. However, at a time when we are going to insist that the executive branch make some reductions in expenditures I think that an increase of more than 25 percent in this instance is a little out of line.

I realize that there has been a salary increase. The committee used \$92,860 last year. I am wondering whether the Senator would be willing to go along with \$100,000 in this instance. I would point out that that amount would comfortably take care of the salary increase.

I know that the argument will be made that this figure covers only 11 months. However, this is a period of 11 months that we are now discussing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to check the Senator on one matter. The Senator referred to our using \$93,000. The Senator knows that that amount was for 11 months.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct, and I expected that argument.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This figure would be with the 12th month added.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am aware of that. The projection is from January to February 1, 1969.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that figure is being adjusted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am referring to the committee reports.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The amount that the committee provided of \$120,000 is on the basis of 12 months. I understand eleven-twelfths of that amount will be available to the committee. Instead of the amount being the amount I just stated, we would get the full amount, but the month of February would be charged against it, so that 12 months would be charged against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is

correct. However, there were 12 months in 1964 and there were 12 months in the year preceding that.

I go back to the point that in 1965 the amount was \$100,689; in 1964, \$73,800; in 1963, \$77,000; the year before last, \$103,000; and last year, \$92,000, based on the committee report; and the committee report is all that I have to go on.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator said the amount was \$93,000.

That amount is for only 11 months.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, there are only 11 months of this year left.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We never know. There is a variation every year. If we have many long hearings and investigations, the hearings would cost a great deal of money.

We prepared a budget which the committee checked, and it was sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration and they recommended \$120,000.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the committee of the Senator from Alabama requested \$146,000, as the Senator knows.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was on the basis of employing two additional employees.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Senator is correct. We went over that request. The full committee considered it, we compromised upon the figure of \$120,000, and that is the figure we are asking be appropriated this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am perfectly willing to operate on that basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I notice that in the very next resolution, No. 949, the Committee on Banking and Currency is requesting \$150,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the Subcommittee on Housing, and that is the subject of a separate resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But it is for the Subcommittee on Housing, and the amount is limited to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to say that under rule VIII the 5 minutes of the Senator from Delaware have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I object to the resolution, then, unless we can work it out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution goes over.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate Resolution 206, Calendar No. 949, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing and urban affairs, including urban mass transportation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate Resolution 252, Calendar No. 950, to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, over.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we are operating under the 5-minute rule. If I thought we could work out some of the questions I would be glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. COTTON. Is it the intention of the Senator to object to all of these measures?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not necessarily; but I did want to discuss this particular one. The resolution requests an increase of \$105,000. I do not believe we could do it in 5 minutes. That is my point. If the Senator wishes to discuss it, he can.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, is it in order to ask unanimous consent on this particular resolution for the Committee on Commerce to have 10 minutes instead of 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can request unanimous consent for additional time at any time.

Mr. COTTON. If I secure 10 minutes, would that satisfy the Senator?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know. It would depend on the explanation. I would not want to promise. I assure the Senator I am not trying to be facetious about this. I am willing to try to work out the matter.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order be vacated whereby we were taking up the unobjected-to bills under rule VIII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we do take the bills in sequence without a time limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we start with Calendar No. 948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider Senate Resolution 209, Calendar No. 948, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, and to provide additional funds therefor, reported from the Committee

on Banking and Currency without amendment, and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$145,000" and insert "\$120,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) banking and currency generally;
- (2) financial aid to commerce and industry;
- (3) deposit insurance;
- (4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;
- (5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;
- (6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;
- (7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;
- (8) securities and exchange regulations;
- (9) credit problems of small business; and
- (10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama again if he would be willing to work out some agreement for a reduction in this amount rather than to provide for a 25-percent increase.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this matter was submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration. First, it had been submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency and they voted unanimously for it. This request is sponsored by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and by myself. Then, it was sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, according to the procedures of the Senate. We gave a full explanation.

We provided only for what we thought was a sufficient amount of money to pay for those additional costs that Congress voted, plus two employees that we requested, and some margin to take care of contingencies.

The Committee on Rules and Administration considered that \$120,000 was sufficient.

I am perfectly willing to stand on that amount but I do not feel disposed to take any less.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I notice that the next resolution asks for a \$30,000 increase. Could we reach some agreement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let us handle the next one when we get to it. These are separate resolutions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move that this particular resolution be amended on page 3, line 2, by striking out the figure "\$120,000" and substituting in lieu thereof "\$105,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, in lieu of "\$120,000" proposed by the committee, insert "\$105,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amount would still give the committee about a 12-percent increase. I feel that inasmuch as we are asking every agency of Government to hold back that we certainly should demonstrate our willingness to curtail our budget.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency a question on this subject, if he does not mind answering it: Is my understanding correct that the Committee on Banking and Currency is planning to go into a study of gold policy and monetary policy in the coming year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator will recall that during the course of debate yesterday on the gold cover bill, both the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] asked for certain studies to be made, and we gave them assurance that we would conduct those studies. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is probable, then, that the work of the committee may be expanded, at least in this field, during the coming year; is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right. It carries with it the recording which, after all, is a very expensive item in any committee's operations.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee a question, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that he may yield to me for the purpose of propounding a question to the chairman, without his losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Was the investigation of

the gold situation enumerated when the budget was presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was it included?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not recall. I would have to look at the RECORD to see. Certainly it lies within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, but at that time it was not known that we were going to have this legislation, therefore, it may not have been included. It certainly is within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee as a part of its supervisory operations.

Yes, I see that it is in the report which accompanies the bill. Here is one item on the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies as well as international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. So that by reason of the questions raised on the floor yesterday, there will be no additional requests made for funds from the contingent fund for a gold study; is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We do not anticipate that. But let me say to the Senator that we are charged under the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946, as the Senator knows, with supervision of certain agencies and departments and activities that are placed within the jurisdiction of our respective committees. Who knows when some problem will come up unexpectedly. I certainly would not want to rule out something wholly unforeseen or unforeseeable; but I surely do not anticipate anything such as the Senator has suggested.

Mr. CURTIS. The matter that was raised yesterday on the floor of the Senate, as of today, is not unforeseen.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; but as I say, although we do not anticipate anything in connection with that, I want to leave the other in.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that last year one of the arguments made was that there would be a study of a major revision of the housing program. That study has been made and the bill has been reported or is about ready to be reported. Why can we not use some of the same staff members for the new study? There will still be an increase—even after the amendment now pending is adopted—of 15 percent more than they had last year.

I am interested in the study on gold, but I most respectfully suggest to the Senator from Alabama that rather than have a \$100,000 study on the problems of gold. The Senate could just recognize the fact that the reason for difficulties we are confronting with gold could be found in just about 2 seconds; namely, that as a government we are spending more than we have—and today Congress seems to be leading the parade in the continuous deficit spending.

Deficit spending is one of the major contributing factors which has undermined the confidence of the world in our currency. We tried to call upon the executive branch to cut back on its expenditures and by a margin of just one

vote in the committee yesterday we failed to provide for a mandatory cut in executive branch expenditures by \$8 billion.

This is something that must be done. Another effort will be made, and we in Congress are going to have to vote on that particular proposal. We should, therefore, have behind us a record of having displayed some frugality in our own budget.

In this instance, the committee has cut back on what was asked for, yes; but even the figure here would still give a 15-percent increase to this particular committee, the one committee which of all committees in Congress should be concerned about deficits and should have an interest in trying to protect the American dollar and our gold supply. The way to do that is to stop spending more money than we have. We cannot do it if we are going to continue to add onto these appropriations 20, 30, and 40 percent.

I hope that this modest approach can be agreed upon to demonstrate to the executive branch that we are willing to follow our own rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Mis-

souri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—11

Aiken	Ellender	Mundt
Baker	Fannin	Thurmond
Boggs	Hatfield	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Miller	

NAYS—43

Anderson	Fong	Montoya
Bartlett	Gruening	Moss
Bennett	Hart	Pearson
Brewster	Hayden	Proxmire
Brooke	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Burdick	Hill	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Spong
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Cotton	Long, La.	Yarborough
Dirksen	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Dodd	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Dominick	McIntyre	
Ervin	Metcalfe	

NOT VOTING—46

Allott	Harris	Mansfield
Bayh	Hartke	McCarthy
Bible	Holland	McClellan
Carlson	Hollings	Mondale
Case	Hruska	Monroney
Church	Javits	Morse
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Morton
Eastland	Kennedy, N.Y.	Murphy
Fulbright	Kuchel	Muskie
Gore	Lausche	Nelson
Griffin	Long, Mo.	Pastore
Hansen	Magnuson	Pell

Percy	Scott	Tydings
Proutty	Smathers	Williams, N.J.
Ribicoff	Talmadge	
Russell	Tower	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 206) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing and urban affairs, including urban mass transportation, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment; on page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$163,000" and insert "\$150,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing and urban affairs, including urban mass transportation.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the committee considered this resolution very carefully. It was recommended to the Senate by the chairman of the full committee unanimously, which included the majority and the minority. The committee asked for \$163,000—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order, and will the

Chair direct the attachés to keep down their voices and conversations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Senate Chamber.

Senators will please return to their seats. Attachés who do not have business here on this resolution will retire to the rear of the Chamber. If there is further disorder, they will be asked to leave the Chamber.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as I said, the committee asked for \$163,000, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, after hearing the request, cut the figure to \$150,000.

We ask that the \$150,000 be authorized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it seems to me that the mere fact that the committee asked for \$163,000 and it was cut to \$150,000 does not necessarily mean they saved \$13,000. They could have asked for \$200,000, and it could have been cut to \$150,000; then, it could be claimed that they had saved \$50,000. We could balance the budget that way.

I wonder if we could get an explanation from the chairman of the committee as to why they need the \$150,000, which is about 20 percent more than the committee used last year.

Last year the committee used \$122,000. In 1966 it used \$125,000.

In 1965 it used \$119,000.

In 1964 it used \$107,000.

In 1963 it used \$90,132.

I wonder why they feel they need \$150,000 this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I believe the figures the Senator is reading are those that were available when I wrote to the chairman of the committee submitting our program.

Actually, as I recall, the committee last year received this amount, \$150,000, and turned back \$17,000. I believe that was what we turned back, or anticipated we would turn back.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is approximately correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We turned back \$17,000. I point out that the reason the \$163,000 was requested was because we wanted to add one more employee to the staff. We have either eight or nine staff members. This subcommittee is frugally operated. It is charged with supervision over all Government housing activities and all of the Government housing programs. There are 50 different and separate programs over which we are charged with maintaining supervisory attention in the various departments and agencies. We try to discharge that obligation. Incidentally, those programs involve a contingent Government obligation of \$110 billion.

I believe that Senators who have had occasion to call on our committee for help, or to use its services, know that we do a good job. We do it with a small staff, and we do it with what I consider to be the utmost frugality. I pledge the continuation of that kind of program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I love and respect everybody on the Committee on

Banking and Currency. What I am about to say has to do with the order of doing things in the Senate generally, and is certainly not stated in any personal sense with reference to Senators or to individuals of excellent character who become staff members.

I believe that one of the problems the Senate must face is that we are violating the Reorganization Act of some 12 years ago, which combined the committees. We have too many subcommittees. I believe that we get more efficient use of our staffs if the parent committee handles all matters and has a staff that can be assigned to varying duties. When we branch out and establish more subcommittees, they become entities in themselves, competing for the attention of the press and the country.

This does not apply to the Committee on Banking and Currency any more than to any other committee. I am talking about general principles involving the operation of the Senate. Having served on the Committee on Rules, to which these requests have come year after year, this is one of the points with which I have been impressed. I have likewise been impressed with the efforts of several committees which have succeeded in reducing their cost of operation. We have one committee in the Senate that has reduced its cost of operation from nearly \$1.5 million down to a little more than \$100,000.

I have also heard annual references, in connection with this housing study, that we have billions of dollars of contingent liability for the Government in housing, and therefore we should have a certain size staff to look after it.

The Committee on Finance has jurisdiction of the management of the national debt. If we ever adopt the same yardstick for that committee, we are going to have to import laborers from abroad to staff the Committee on Finance, the way the national debt is growing.

But that is not an appropriate yardstick. With the kindest of feelings and due respect, I hate to be guilty of having voted for great sums of money to study housing year after year, and then have it said that the poor taxpayer has 50 different agencies to deal with in connection with housing.

That raises a question in my mind. I think that some of this money ought to be used in seeking to simplify the situation. You can confuse the average taxpayer with a dozen housing agencies; you do not need 50.

Here is another thing: I have sat in on a housing hearing or two this year. We had one before the Committee on Finance. Several witnesses appeared and said that our public housing program was a complete failure. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], among others, said that our public housing program had failed. I shall not attempt to quote his exact language.

That was rather interesting to me, because I had opposed much of the public housing legislation. I think housing is sort of a private affair. I do not like socialism generally, and I have been pictured by adversaries back home as some-

one who wanted people to live out in the snowstorm, because I was opposed to public housing.

So I was delighted—I am sorry it was true, but I was delighted—to have it said that all these hundreds of millions of dollars for public housing had failed to accomplish the objective.

For as long as I can remember, we have had a Subcommittee on Housing guiding the housing policy of the country. Yet, if I read the newspapers correctly, one of the most urgent needs in this country is that for housing in the slums and ghettos. One of the things that is alleged to have prompted marches upon Washington is the fact that we do not have proper housing. All of these 50 agencies or 50 housing programs, do they exist to provide Government housing for the well to do, the middle class, the able bodied who ought to be able to get houses for themselves? Or where do we begin?

I rise, not to scold the Committee on Banking and Currency, but to point out that I believe the thing that is causing the acute shortage of space in the Senate Office Buildings is too many subcommittees. I believe that is the thing that is taking so much time of Senators—too many subcommittees. Because after a subcommittee handles a matter, then it has to be rehearsed before the full committee; and I believe that one of the things that is adding to the growth of Government is too many subcommittees. Bright, ambitious staff people like to see their ideas transformed into great new Government programs. So when you create a subcommittee, you create a staff, it grows, it takes more rooms, Senators are cut down on the space they can use, and then, in order for the subcommittee to prove its worth, a new program has to be recommended.

Mr. President, it just so happens that I made this speech at this point. I do not want to single out the Banking and Currency Committee as an individual committee. However, I feel that there should be a trend to reduce the number of subcommittees, thereby reducing the staff, the members of which fill our hallways and corridors and take up all the available building space. Perhaps we would not get the time then in which to enact 50 housing programs, and thus bewilder the taxpayer or the individual who is justly deserving of some assistance in housing. We might end up with just a few programs that are simple and understandable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska. He has made an excellent point.

Mr. President, for this particular subcommittee last year, at their request I supported their full request. I said at that time that I thought the housing industry needed a thorough examination. I was hopeful that out of that investigation something more constructive might develop. However, we still have the same conglomeration of housing and the same confusion.

I sometimes wonder if we would not make better progress if we were to abolish some of these subcommittees, get rid of much of the staff, and let the commit-

tee members recognize that we are not a government of staffs but a government of Senators. Perhaps if the individual Senators—including myself—devote a little more of our time to our own duties instead of delegating them to the staffs we might know a little more about what is going on.

Let us face it, the housing situation has not been improved in the last 12 months. It is in a demoralized state. Originally the FHA did a wonderful job. It had a noble objective and did help a lot of people get homes who could not have done so otherwise. I fully support that objective. However, in recent years the agency has not been designed nor has it been working for the advantage of the home buyer, but rather for the builders and the promoters.

I cite the point system, which is one of the most vicious formulas sponsored by the U.S. Government. This is a system under which the Government was to reduce the cost of housing. We heard many great speeches in its support. Some of these speeches will go down in history as the most outstanding oratory delivered in the U.S. Senate in denunciation of high interest rates. Those speeches pointed out how the high interest rates were dangerous to the average homeowners and discouraged them from buying homes.

Yet here is an agency that is doing more to increase interest costs than any other agency of the Government. I cite how they are financing secondary mortgages through the sale of FNMA participation certificates. These are 100 percent Government-guaranteed obligations, the same as Government bonds, but draw a half percent more interest than Government bonds. This is unnecessary.

It is like being in a bankers' paradise.

The average home buyer is being told that we are holding down by law the amount that can be charged as interest. At one point it was 4½, later 5 percent interest. I do not know what it is now, but it is around 5¾ percent. However, the individual cannot borrow money for that rate. Under the point system he is forced to sign a mortgage for \$10,000 in order to buy a \$9,000 home. Under the point system it can go as high as 8 and 10 points in certain areas.

How does that work for the home buyer? It figures out on a 30-year mortgage that under the point system he is in reality paying as much as 8 percent interest and sometimes more. And it has another disadvantage. If the person is a bad credit risk—and I emphasize bad credit risk—the lender or the mortgage company makes more money than he would make with a good credit risk, because he buys this \$10,000 mortgage for \$9,000. That mortgage carries a Government-guarantee to pay for that mortgage if it is in default beyond a certain number of months.

If a man takes out a \$10,000 mortgage on his home he has a \$10,000 mortgage with 6 percent interest. Then at the end of 12 months if the mortgage is in default the lender who buys the mortgage for \$9,000 collects not only the 6 percent interest guaranteed by the U.S. Government, but he also collects 10

points from the U.S. Government, or a total of 16 percent interest.

If the mortgage is in default at the end of 2 years the lender collects half of the points involved, or 11 percent interest. And the poorer the credit risk the more money the lender makes.

Whoever heard of an agency of the Government promoting a program under the guise of helping the housing industry and home buyers by endorsing a program which is deliberately—and it must be deliberately because it has not been changed in the last 3 years although they have known about it—set up so that the lenders can make more money on a bad credit risk than they can on a good, honest fellow who pays his mortgage out over 30 or 40 years.

If the good, honest fellow makes his payments and pays off his mortgage over 40 years the 10 points are amortized over the 40 years and involves only one-fourth of a point per year.

That policy should be corrected. However, what correction did we get? We still have a continuation of that policy, and now they are asking a 20-percent increase for the Housing Subcommittee so that they can examine it again.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not understand where the Senator gets the idea that there is a 20-percent increase when it is exactly the amount that it was last year in spite of the fact that pay raises were voted and will have to be absorbed. Furthermore, with reference to the dissertation of the Senator on the point system, the Senator knows that I am as much opposed to the point system as he is. We have discussed that matter on the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct; however, Congress has done nothing about it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator knows that there is on the calendar right now a bill that has been reported from our committee, a bill that does the very thing the Senator has urged us to do in the past—to remove that ceiling on the interest rates. Lots of opposition has been expressed to that measure. Nevertheless, our committee voted to report the measure to the Senate.

We are doing everything we can. I do not see why we should receive a whipping such as this when we are doing everything we can to bring about the situation that the Senator says ought to exist. We have already reported the bill, and it is on the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, if the committee has already done that that is one reason why it does not need the increase. But I point out that it has not been done yet. It is on the calendar. I was unsuccessful last year in getting through an amendment to accomplish one of the steps that must be taken, as the Senator points out—the removal of the ceiling on interest rates. We are in a period of high interest rates, under the Johnson regime.

In fact, the Johnson administration can boast of the highest interest rates in the past 100 years.

What a record.

We should have a provision in the law that under no circumstances would the Federal Government guarantee an obligation in excess of the amount that was committed by the lender. For instance, it should provide that if the lender buys a \$10,000 mortgage for \$9,000, the Government will guarantee the lender the payment of \$9,000 and not guarantee him the extra 10 points so that he can make an extra profit if a bad credit risk is involved.

As I read the bill as reported I do not think it corrects that last point. That matter has to be corrected.

I point out that for the past few years I have discussed some of the abuses in the housing program on several occasions. As the Senator from Alabama knows, I have called attention to the many abuses in the housing program that have developed. I have called these to the attention of the committee which is asking for the \$150,000 appropriation to examine such abuses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows that he has gotten most of his information from our committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, no, I have not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I did not. However, for the moment let us proceed on the premise that the committee did know about these abuses. That only makes it worse.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We were working on it, and the information was furnished to the Senator from Delaware from time to time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I did not know the committee knew about all the information I have been receiving; and if they do, that is even worse. If they knew about it why did they not do something about it? Why has the committee not done something about these abuses if they knew about it? I have not heard of any report the committee has made.

For example, there is the case of a housing project in Tucson, Ariz. The Senator said he knew about it. The money was loaned in this particular case, and the man had an option on 1,300-some acres of land. He carved 243 acres out of the middle of it, and he borrowed from the Government—a Government-guaranteed loan in excess of 100 percent of the cost. They allowed enough on the 243 acres to practically pay for the 1,300 acres. Together with the building, they built a golf course, swimming pool, and everything on those acres, all at the expense of the Government and in the center of the 1,300-acre project on which he had an option.

This project went broke, and now he is making money by selling lots around the project using the golf course and the swimming pools which were built with Government money. The loan is in default. I am surprised that the committee knew about that and kept so silent.

Then we have the case of the dentist

from Washington, D.C. He was approved for four different FHA construction loans. He went bankrupt on all four loans, and the amount of the mortgage was approximately 105 to 112 percent of the actual cost, which gave him a windfall profit in each case of several million dollars.

His loan was approved in four different areas, under four different names, all guaranteed by the U.S. Government. And we are now told that the committee knew all about it. Maybe they did; but what did they do?

This man applied for a housing project in Texas. It was rejected at the Texas level as not being economically feasible. He applied to the District director and asked him to override the underwriters. They affirmed and said it was not feasible; and in addition they said this was a lousy credit risk and should not be insured. He appealed to the regional division. They went further and said that he had a record of having defrauded the Government in every project he had with them and that therefore he should be turned down.

He appealed to Washington, and Washington sent a directive to the director in the area to approve this project immediately—"We promised it by X date." The director said, "I will resign before I will approve it. It is a bad risk."

They moved the application from Texas to Albany. It was approved and signed there. The man got his money, the project is bankrupt, and he has never paid.

Today I am told that the committee knew all about it. If it did, why has something not been done about it? What is being done about it? We want to know.

Here is another case that the committee may know about; and I do not have the answer to it, but I would like to have it now. I have been trying to get the answer for a year. A year ago this past December a rather serious allegation was called to my attention to the effect that certain employees of the FHA were accepting bribes and kickbacks from a certain named contractor in the Miami area. It was a rather clear case if we proceeded on the assumption that it was true.

I submitted the matter to Commissioner Brownstein and received a report from him that he was investigating the matter. I waited until approximately July of last year and asked for a report. I was then told that it was a rather nasty, sticky situation, that the report had been referred to the Department of Justice, and that they would rather not report to me because they wanted it properly handled in the courts. I agreed with that. It should go to the courts. That is the way to handle it. I went along again.

I heard nothing. I saw no notice of it in the papers. Last December I contacted them again and asked, "What report do you have on it, and what has Justice done?" I got a report back that Justice decided it did not intend to prosecute. I asked the agency, "What have you done?"

They said, "We're still looking at it." I said, "Tell me where are the three

men named and what happened to the contractor?"

All this is in a letter which I can put into the RECORD; but I guess the Senator from Alabama knows all about it, and he can tell us the rest of the story. I got a letter back saying that they had suspended the contractor because he was not fit to do business with. The three men have all been transferred by the agency. They have been transferred to other cities, still working for the FHA, but I am told there is really nothing wrong—"We have nothing to prove they were wrong."

I ask this question: Why was it so important last July that the matter be referred to the Department of Justice? And if it was important enough to send to the Department of Justice, and not important enough to fire the men who were the men not permitted to remain in the area in which they had been working?

If the committee is going to conduct an investigation these are the things about which we should be told.

Surely the Senator from Alabama can give us the answer. I did not realize until today that he had all the answers to these questions. If I had known I would have conferred with him instead of with the department downtown.

Then there is the case of the application involving a project for a home for the elderly in Texas. They applied for the project in the amount of x dollars. The amount was based on the actuarial life expectancy of the people who would be living in the project. The insurance company has an actuarial table showing the life expectancy of the various individuals. This was figured on an average age of the occupants, and the loan was based upon the life expectancy. The reason why that is a factor is that when people in this project bought apartments in the building all they bought was a lifetime right. When they died the apartments reverted to the company, to the cooperative, to be resold. So if the average life expectancy of the people in that area was 12 years, it meant that there would be, on the average, a rollover in the resale of those apartments each 12 years; and that was counted in the computation to give them the amount of the loan requested.

The sponsor wanted an extra three-quarters of a million dollars. He could not justify it. So how did he get around justifying it? With the cooperation of the FHA the average life expectancy of these applicants was lowered from 12 years to 9 years, which gave them a rollover every 9 years. In this way, they could justify giving him the extra money. That project went broke afterward, which proves it was not justified.

But the point is this. This loan was approved at the largest figure on the premise that the occupants, the elderly people who would move into this Government housing project, would die 3 years sooner than if they lived somewhere else. How cruel can one get to justify a loan by a Government agency? In other words, if you live in a Government financed house you will die 25 percent sooner than if you live somewhere else.

Today we are told the committee knows

all about it. Well, what has it done about it?

If we want to discuss this matter further I have the time. But I repeat, the housing industry does need an investigation. I supported such an investigation last year, and I thought we could get something done. If the committee has developed all this information and has published it, show me the records, and I will apologize for the fact that I did not read the notice. I surely would like to be enlightened because these abuses were going on then, and these are the things on which I supported the investigation.

Frankly, I believe we would be better advised to abolish completely the subcommittee, with all due respect, and try a little more enforcement of the laws that have been violated. But at least I am not going along with increasing the appropriations so far as this particular situation is concerned.

The figures submitted by the committee indicate that the committee had \$90,000 in 1963; \$107,000 in 1964, \$119,000 in 1965, \$125,000 in 1966, and \$122,000 in 1967, and today they are asking for \$150,000.

Mr. President, the maximum that should be allowed in this instance is \$125,000. That amount raises questions, but I will go along with it for the sake of harmony.

I move that on page 2, line 20, the figure "\$150,000" be stricken and that "\$125,000" be inserted.

Some day we will need a special committee to investigate the need of so many investigating committees.

This is getting to be ridiculous as well as expensive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope the chairman will accept the amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No, Mr. President, I am beginning to wonder why the Committee on Rules and Administration spent three sessions going over all of these requests, cutting them down, and trying to work them out, when on the floor of the Senate each request has to be taken up individually and the wisdom questioned of the people who made the request.

We cannot agree to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, with all respect to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, I have often wondered in the past about certain decisions that the Committee on Rules and Administration made.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator restate the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On page 2, line 20, strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$125,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the star print the figure appears on line 21.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the same item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Aiken	Ellender	Miller
Boggs	Fannin	Mundt
Curtis	Hatfield	Thurmond
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.

NAYS—43

Anderson	Fong	Moss
Baker	Gruening	Pearson
Bartlett	Hart	Proxmire
Bennett	Hayden	Randolph
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Smith
Brooke	Hill	Sparkman
Burdick	Inouye	Spong
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Stennis
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Symington
Cannon	Long, La.	Tydings
Cooper	McGee	Yarborough
Cotton	McGovern	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Dodd	Metcalf	
Ervin	Montoya	

NOT VOTING—45

Allott	Hollings	Morton
Bayh	Hruska	Murphy
Bible	Javits	Muskie
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Nelson
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pastore
Church	Kuchel	Pell
Clark	Lausche	Percy
Eastland	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Fulbright	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Gore	Mansfield	Russell
Griffin	McCarthy	Scott
Hansen	McClellan	Smathers
Harris	Mondale	Talmadge
Hartke	Monroney	Tower
Holland	Morse	Williams, N.J.

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 252) to authorize the Committee on Commerce to make certain studies which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed" strike "\$550,000" and insert "\$525,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) interstate commerce generally, including consumer protection;
- (2) foreign commerce generally;
- (3) transportation generally;
- (4) maritime matters;
- (5) interoceanic canals;
- (6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines and highway safety;
- (7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;
- (8) Federal power matters;
- (9) civil aeronautics;
- (10) fisheries and wildlife;
- (11) marine sciences; and
- (12) weather services and modification, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$525,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I recognize the futility of asking for a series of yea-and-nay votes. I am not trying to be too bothersome about this but I thought that at a time when we are asking the executive branch to hold down costs in its operating departments it would be only proper that we in Congress should practice the same rules.

What disturbs me is that there are so many subcommittees developing in too many instances to the point that each Member seems to feel there must be more staff members. I wonder whether we are not becoming overstaffed.

I realize the mood of the Senate. I shall therefore try to point out in general why I think the Senate should have made reductions in our own expenditures.

For example, the pending resolution on the Commerce Committee provides for \$525,000 next year, as compared with \$420,000 last year and \$429,000 in 1966.

Following this resolution there is another one for the Committee on Foreign Relations. In 1963 this committee operated on \$95,000; in 1964, \$86,000; in

1965, \$84,000; in 1966, \$145,000; and in 1967, \$183,000. For 1968 they ask for \$225,000. In other words, each year it has been consistently increasing. This year there seems to be a 20-percent increase.

The Government Operations Committee was \$428,000 last year.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment.

Mr. COTTON. I ask the Senator to yield only for the reason that before he went on to another committee, I think the question on people's minds regarding the Commerce Committee should be answered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in just a moment.

The Government Operations Committee for 1966 received \$392,000. In 1967 it was \$428,000. They are asking \$750,000 this year, an increase of \$322,000. There is another request for a subcommittee on the Government Operations Committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut, which was acted on earlier, an increase from \$105,000 to \$115,000. There was another request for another subcommittee on the Government Operations Committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], which had \$94,000 last year. They are asking for \$105,000 this year, an increase of 15 percent.

Mr. President, I could go right on down the line. I do not see a single resolution providing for any decreases. Every single one provides for an increase. Some of the increases range from 20 percent to 40 percent, and some of them are almost double.

I think it is most unwise that we should be permitting these increases at a time when the run on the dollar is disturbing, and at a time when we are operating the Government with a deficit on the average of \$2 billion a month. Next week I am going to make a determined drive, at least, to try to put a ceiling on the expenditures of the Government as a whole. I feel that if the Congress votes on that question it should, at the same time, try to put its own house in order.

Recognizing the futility of asking for further rollcall votes on these resolutions, however, I am going to leave it at that and shall vote against every one which carries any increase.

I shall not pursue this matter any further.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware. I practiced law long enough to have learned one lesson, that if one's opponent has conceded, then do not make an argument and lose it.

However, I think that I must say one word about the Commerce Committee's request because my distinguished chairman, the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is necessarily absent. It so happens that as the ranking minority member, I was with him when the Commerce Committee presented its case to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, subject, of course, to correction from the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I would like to mention a couple of matters. In the first

place, I would like to tax the patience of the Senate for just 1 minute to comment on the general proposal of my friend from Delaware. I have great respect and admiration for him, because he has been one of the most able and consistent fighters for economy all through the years he has been in the Senate; but he talks about the Senate committees being overstaffed.

I have been sitting around the Congress for 22 years. I served on the Appropriations Committee in the House and do now in the Senate, and on the Committee on Commerce in the Senate. There never is a time when the departments downtown send their representatives to the Congress when the department or bureau head does not sit in front of the committee flanked by a small army of assistants, budget officers, analysts, and experts in every field. No Senate committee or congressional committee can deal effectively or intelligently with the complicated fiscal problems that we have unless there is at least a reasonable staff to advise and inform the committee.

So far as the appropriation for the Commerce Committee is concerned, I am sure every Senator knows that the Commerce Committee, since it was reorganized, and numerous committees were consolidated under it, has become something of a catchall.

So this committee handles more diverse subjects than almost any other committee in the Senate. All matters dealing with transportation, communication, and various other subjects are assigned to us.

We have, for this coming year, a whole batch of rather important consumer legislation. It has to be carefully considered and screened in order that those of real merit may be handled. We have a bill on automobile insurance which, in itself, is an exhaustive subject, and on which we will have long hearings and much study. With respect to door-to-door sales, I do not know what other Senators have experienced, but I have been deluged with more mail on that subject than on any other since I have been in Congress except that dealing with humane treatment of animals. We have a home improvement frauds bill. We have the old subject of cigarette advertising. We are still operating on the bills we passed in an oversight capacity with automobile safety, truth in lending, a national commission on product safety.

In addition, and something new last year, is the highly controversial and highly technical matter of a power reliability bill relating to electric utilities. Because of its far-reaching effects, it will require several hearings in various parts of the United States.

A hearing has already been held on the west coast. One will be held in New York or New England. One will be held in the South or Southeast, Southwest, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and Ohio. All of these facts should be borne in mind.

In addition, the Senator was accurate in one sense, but a little inaccurate in another, when he compared the request of this year with the request in other years. He was not giving the appropri-

tion in other years; he was giving what was used.

From last year's appropriation, the chairman returned over \$20,000. Last year's appropriation was \$475,000. This year we are asking for \$525,000, an increase of \$50,000.

Over the last 5 years Chairman Magnuson has returned to the Senate approximately \$200,000, an average of \$40,000 a year.

My friend might say that they asked for too much, and might ask, "Why did they ask for so much when they did not use it?" My answer to that is that this year we have laid out, on the consumers bill and various other bills, a program that requires much time and attention. It is quite possible that in an election year, with the recesses for party conventions, some of them will not be able to be taken care of. But a chairman who has the record of having returned, without using, these surplus funds, when he is heading a committee of such diverse activities, I submit should not be penalized by the Senate because of his absolute care and diligence in returning funds.

Downtown they do not act that way. At least, some of them do not. Toward the end of the year, when they find they have funds on their hands, they spend them as fast as they can, because they know that, if any funds are left over, Congress will say they do not need as much. Senator MAGNUSON does not work that way.

I hope my Democratic friends will please not listen to this. May I say to my friends on this side of the aisle that for 3 years now I have been asking the chairman for one more Republican assistant for the minority. We had four. Business has grown so much that we need an extra one in order to cover all the hearings and cover our work. When the chairman got the increase last year from the committee, he told me I was going to have that extra assistant. We did not get him. I asked him about it. He smiled that rather enigmatic smile he has, and said, "You did not press me hard enough." I saw to it this year that I pressed him hard enough. He has given the Republican minority an extra staff member.

I hope my friends on this side of the aisle will be appreciative of that and realize that some \$18,000 or \$19,000 of this extra money comes to our side of the committee.

In addition, nearly \$25,000 of the increase is for the increased salaries of the staff, which were raised by the Congress just before the end of the last year.

Mr. President, I have said more than is necessary to say, in view of the fact that the Senator from Delaware so kindly said he did not oppose the resolution; but I did not want the RECORD left with any suggestion that this committee, with what we have to face, is asking for too much.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I speak for the Democratic side because, as the Senator from New Hampshire said, the

chairman of the committee [Mr. Magnuson] is unavoidably absent. As a matter of fact, when we speak of the work of the Committee on Commerce, I do not think we can properly say there are two sides or that there is any partisanship. I know I have never been a member of a committee that is less free of partisanship in any way. Every member of the committee is trying to do a common job.

Mr. COTTON. We are trying to do an uncommon job.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, that is better put. That job is, in all its phases, for the people. One has only to look through the 31-page report—32 pages including the table—to discover that the Committee on Commerce is uniquely concerned with the needs, demands, and aspirations of the people.

The Senator from New Hampshire spoke properly about the proposed legislation for consumers which has been before the committee and is now before it. If we could come here and ask for a budget of \$10,000, we would all be pleased. But we cannot. It takes research to do the job, and research can be accomplished only by staff personnel.

In light of the fact that, as the Senator from New Hampshire has said with respect to returns of money to the Treasury, not too much has been requested, I hope the resolution will be agreed to as it stands.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Alaska. I neglected to mention that another new problem of the committee—and this has been urgently requested by the Secretary of Transportation—is to develop a new approach to the merchant marine problem. The distinguished Senator from Alaska is a leader in our committee in all matters pertaining to the merchant marine, the Coast Guard, and many other activities, including fish and wildlife. He knows that that request in itself will require much study and attention by members of the staff and by the subcommittee, as well.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do know that, but I did not want to go into it further because to do so would take too long a time.

I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that we have a great chairman, and we have a great leader on the minority side. We have diligent, effective members. Ours is one of the great committees of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there is a favorite quotation of mine which goes:

The lady doth protest too much, methinks.

I conceded defeat, but I am being tempted by the Senator from New Hampshire as I hear this argument; I wonder if I did not throw in the sponge too quickly.

I was recognizing the facts of life, but I do not wish to concede the point that I think these committees are overexpanded. I have great respect for this committee and its members. I have respect for the committee more particularly because a few years ago I served as a member of it and was proud of it.

In 1963 they operated for \$247,000; in 1964, \$344,000; 1965, \$400,000; 1966, \$429,000; 1967, \$420,000; and this year they are asking for \$525,000.

As the Senator points out, last year they were allowed \$475,000, and they returned \$55,000 of that amount, using only \$420,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In just a moment; let me finish, and then I shall yield and permit the Senator to tempt me a little further. I do not need much more, either.

My point is this: Here is a committee that asked for \$475,000 last year. They had \$55,000 more than they needed; so this year they ask for another \$50,000 more than they asked for last year, or \$525,000.

I do not understand that reasoning. I have great respect for the Senator from New Hampshire and the fact that he wants a staff member, but that staff member will not cost \$105,000. Yet that is the amount we are asked to appropriate more than was spent last year.

While I realize a good Republican is worth more, perhaps, than any other species of mankind, I do not believe that even we have one worth \$105,000. Let us be realistic: We just do not need that money; or at least in my opinion we do not.

As far as interest in the consumer is concerned, of course, the committee has an interest in the consumer, and so do I. But consumers are taxpayers; and as taxpayers they have to pay for these expenditures which we are appropriating.

In closing I have one last comment. The Senator says that one problem that gave him a lot of trouble, in correspondence, was the humane treatment of animals. I wonder if we should not give a little more humane treatment to the American taxpayers, who are having to underwrite these costs. If we do not start pretty soon we may get an avalanche of letters from those same taxpayers that will overshadow what was done when we were discussing inhumane treatment of animals.

I shall vote against the resolution. I had not planned to ask for any more yea-and-nay votes on these matters, recognizing that many Senators have plans and realizing also that no doubt we will not receive many votes. But I want the Record to show that I feel these appropriations should be rolled back to a much more realistic level. I say that with great respect both for this committee and all the committees involved.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I was trying to get the Senator to yield to me to keep him from making a grievous error; but inasmuch as he insisted upon making it, I shall now correct him.

The Senator made the statement that the committee requested \$475,000, spent only \$420,000, and returned the balance to the Treasury.

That is not true. The \$420,000 was for only 11 months of the year. They had to pay 1 more month of bills out of the \$475,000, which meant that the amount turned back, if any, was practically negligible. I was sincerely trying to get the record in proper perspective, to show that there was not \$50,000 turned back unused by the committee last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am wondering if we should not

let this resolution go over until next week and find out what the answer is. I was quoting the figures used by the Senator from New Hampshire, who said that they turned back \$55,000, as I understood him. As to the \$420,000, I am quoting from the committee report. If the Committee on Rules does not know what it is doing and if there is a difference between the members of the committee itself perhaps we should carry the whole matter over and find out what is the truth. I am not manufacturing these figures; I am reading from the committee report.

The committee report shows that there was expended for this purpose \$247,191.68 in 1963; \$344,553.82 in 1964; \$400,891.48 in 1965; \$429,511.26 in 1966, and \$420,755.79 in 1967.

Those are not my figures. Those are the figures that were in the committee report. If they are in error I think we ought to find out for certain what was returned unspent last year.

I do not wish to make a big issue out of this; I just want the record to show that I did not dream these figures up. I only took the figures from the report, and if the man who submitted them to the committee or the committee that accepted them were asleep perhaps we had better wake them up.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator did not completely read the committee report. The reports explain fully in writing, that the amount expended for 11 months of last year was \$420,755.79. The reason for that indication was because all of the expenditures had not been determined for the 12 months at the time the committees had to make their presentation to the Rules Committee. We try to act before the end of January, or we have to get a continuing resolution. Only 11 months of expenditures have been made and paid and accounted for at that time.

That is the reason that the committee print shows the amount expended for 11 months of the 90th Congress, first session. That means 11 months, and not 12.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator had been awake—maybe that is how the slip came about—he would have heard me when I said at the beginning it was for 11 months. But I also said the month of January 1969 did not come in the year 1967, either. We will have the same problem next year, and every year that comes along. Each of these committees goes to the Rules Committee on the 1st of January. There is always a month outstanding. That is true as to every resolution before us. I do not say this to pursue the argument, but the Senator was correct when he used the \$420,000 figure, and so was the Senator from New Hampshire. I understood that was the 11-month figure and was so referring to it, and I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire understood it likewise.

I do not think there is any difference in our position or understanding on that matter. I am not making any great point out of it. However, I did want the

Record to show that I am not pulling a lot of figures out of the air.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I did take the figures from the report, as did the Senator from Delaware. Some complications are involved. I believe that the pay increase went into effect during the latter part of last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Delaware may rest assured that under the leadership of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], working with the senior committee members and with the staff, the Commerce Committee is being operated efficiently and economically and whatever is not used goes back.

That summarizes the whole thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will not pursue the matter. I concur with what the Senator has said about his respect for the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Washington was chairman of the committee when I served on that committee. I enjoyed my service under the Senator from Washington as much as I have enjoyed serving with any other chairman I have worked with.

I do not want anything that I have said to be considered as a reflection on the chairman or on the members of the committee. I was making the statement in general terms. This happened to be a subject we were discussing. I was making a general argument with respect to all of them.

I only hoped that the Senate would take some steps to show that the congressional branch was willing to establish some discipline over its own expenditures as well as asking the executive branch of the Government to do so. Recognizing that we do not have enough votes to get the matter agreed to I merely said that I was going to vote against the resolution in its present form and let it go at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 252) was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 207) to continue for 1 year the authority of the Committee on Finance to employ six additional clerical assistants, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is in line 5, after the word "of" strike out "Public Law 4. Eightieth Congress, approved

February 19, 1947, as amended." and insert "Public Law 90-57, approved July 28, 1967, as amended."; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is authorized from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, to employ six additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 90-57, approved July 28, 1967, as amended.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 207 would continue through 1968 the temporary authority the Senate provided in the 89th Congress for the Finance Committee to hire six additional clerical assistants.

At the time this authority was granted on April 20, 1966, I made it clear to the Senate that new employees would be added to the Finance Committee staff only as the need arose, but advance assurance that we had the authority would enable us to plan an orderly expansion of the Finance Committee staff so that we could provide the services Senators were beginning to demand of the committee. As I reported last year, our expansion has been just that—orderly. In 1966, two secretaries were employed under this new authority—one in July and the other in August. In 1967, two more were added—both in January. In the middle of the year one of them was replaced and a fifth clerical employee was added in August.

At the present time, we have five clerical employees under this authority. On an annual basis these five employees are being compensated, in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act and the applicable pay statutes, at the combined rate of \$38,728.

When the temporary authority for six clerical assistants was granted, the Senate also gave the Finance Committee authority to hire six additional professional employees, providing us with a total professional staff of 10. This additional authority for the professional people was provided on a permanent basis and is not involved in our resolution today. The committee now has four professional employees—one lawyer, two economists, and one expert in the field of social legislation. A fifth employee, an economist, was added for the purpose of coordinating a special staff study of the question of steel imports. This staff study has now been published. It has been widely hailed in steel circles. This economist has now left the staff. The growth of our professional staff pretty well follows the plan of expansion of the Finance Committee I described to the Rules Committee and the Senate back in 1966.

As the demands of our professional staff increase, so that we find it desirable to add additional experts, we will have a need for additional clerical assistants. That is why Senate Resolution 207 requests a continuation of our current temporary authority for six secretaries.

I would hope the Senate will approve this resolution for our clerical staff. On behalf of the Committee on Finance, I urge that it do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 207), as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 226) to provide for a study of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States by the Committee on Foreign Relations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 226

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate, and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$225,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 216) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of Government which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 6, line 21, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$860,000" and insert "\$750,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof is authorized from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or non-compliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided*, That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study to the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State and, further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or interna-

tional commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed until January 31, 1969, to make a full and complete study and investigation of all other aspects of crime and lawlessness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, and safety.

Sec. 5. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed until January 31, 1969, to make a full and complete study and investigation of riots, violent disturbances of the peace, vandalism, civil and criminal disorder, insurrection, the commission of crimes in connection therewith, the immediate and longstanding causes, the extent and effects of such occurrences and crimes, and measures necessary for their immediate and long-range prevention and for the preservation of law and order and to insure domestic tranquility within the United States.

Sec. 6. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1969, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include, in its report specific legislative recommendations.

Sec. 7. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) administer such oath; (5) take such testimony, either orally or by sworn statement; (6) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (7) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee: *Provided further*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

(b) For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized, in its or his or their discretion, as may be deemed advisable, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents.

Sec. 8. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$750,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S MISSTATEMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, about noon today the Secretary of Agriculture held a prearranged press conference in the corridor of the Old Senate Office Building just outside the Agricultural Committee room. The Secretary gave to the press one of the most ridiculous and misleading statements that any Cabinet officer ever issued.

The Secretary undertook to show that everything bad for the farmer had been done by the Republicans and everything good for the farmer had been done by the Democrats. He then went on to say:

Farmers got a good taste of runaway production under the previous Republican Administration. It took six years to clear away the surplus legacy, and every step was doggedly opposed by the Republican leadership in Congress. Five major farm acts have been passed by the Congress from 1961 through 1965. And because of them farm income, while less than it should be, is 50 percent greater than it was in 1960. Proposed by two Democratic Presidents, the acts were passed in Congress by heavy Democratic majorities.

What the Secretary failed to say was that the administration in 1961 asked for virtually totalitarian controls over agriculture and was opposed then by both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. A majority of both parties opposed the Secretary and he did not get the legislation he asked for. Instead, he got more workable, reasonable, and moderate legislation.

The Secretary pointed out this afternoon, however, that farm income, while less than it should be, is 50 percent greater than it was in 1960. He failed to point out that the cost of things the farmer buys has increased so much faster than has farm income that prices of farm products have dropped from 80 percent of parity in 1961 to 74 percent last year. These are the Agriculture Department's own figures. And I believe that it has been at about 74 percent so far this year. So, I think the farmer is infinitely worse off now as far as true values are concerned than he was when the Secretary took over in 1961.

However, that is not the worst of it. What happens when farm parity income hits the skids as it has done since 1961? Farmers are forced out of business.

Here is another fact the Secretary failed to point out—that whereas there were 3,800,000 farmers making a living on the farm in 1961, 742,000 of them have been forced out of business in the last 7 years. The figures which the Department furnishes reveal that less than 3 million farmers remain on the farm today. Twenty-five percent of the farmers of our country in 1961 have been forced out of business during this period in which the Secretary of Agriculture states they have been making such gains.

The Secretary released figures showing the increase in net income. However, he did not release the figures showing the increase in net costs. So, by their own figures, the farmers are much worse off than they were in 1961.

That is all the material that I have had time to prepare in just the last few minutes, but I thought I had better set the record straight as soon as possible after the Secretary had made his statement.

The Secretary brags about forcing 25 percent of the American farmers out of production. When the Secretary of Agriculture says that the farmers have an increased net income, he simply ignores the fact that the increase in costs have exceeded the increase in income to such an extent that the farmer is definitely worse off than he was 7 years ago.

The only solution offered by the administration is: "If we had complete controls, totalitarian controls, over the farmer, he would be living on easy street." However, so far both the Republicans and the Democrats in Congress have had enough sense not to grant those controls which the Department has been requesting.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE OPERATIONS BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 211) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of all matters pertaining to foreign assistance operations by the Federal Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$105,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction, specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the operation of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, with a view to determining the economy and efficiency of such activities.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under

The amendment was agreed to.

this resolution, which shall not exceed \$105,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ORIGIN OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 227) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to study the origin of research and development programs financed by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 3, line 14, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$87,000" and insert "\$85,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the operations of research and development programs financed by departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including research in economics and social science, as well as the basic sciences, biomedicine, research, and technology;

(2) review those programs now being carried out through contracts with higher educational institutions and private organizations, corporations, and individuals to determine the need for the establishment of national research, development, and manpower policies and programs, in order to bring about Government-wide coordination and elimination of overlapping and duplication of scientific and research activities; and

(3) examine existing research information operations, the impact of Federal research and development programs on the economy and on institutions of higher learning, and to recommend the establishment of programs to insure a more equitable distribution of research and development contracts among such institutions and among the States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$85,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 221) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2, line 23, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$148,000," and insert "\$130,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(j) (2) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationship between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86-380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959, as amended by Public Law 89-733, approved by the President on November 2, 1966.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorize (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$130,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 212) to study certain aspects of national security and

international operations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills;

(3) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(4) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods, processes, and relationships.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The resolution (S. Res. 219) authorizing certain investigations by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, including national parks and recreation areas; Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; water and power resources; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; environmental studies; and territories and insular affairs.

Sec. 2. Pursuant to its authority under section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the committee is authorized to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence,

books, papers, documents, and to take such testimony on matters within its jurisdiction as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

The resolution (S. Res. 232) to study administrative practice and procedure, and for other purposes, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practices and procedures within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, investigatory, law enforcement, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 233) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the

United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 3, line 4, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$587,500" and insert "\$560,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$560,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF A STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The resolution (S. Res. 235) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 235

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its activities and findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$110,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 236) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2, line 15, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$228,000" and insert "\$210,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$210,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.
The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 245) to make a full and complete study of the separation of powers under the Constitution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2, line 21, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$90,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 245

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study of the separation of powers between the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of Government provided by the Constitution, the manner in which power has been exercised by each branch and the extent, if any, to which any branch or branches of the Government may have encroached upon the powers, functions, and duties vested in any other branch by the Constitution of the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 237) to investigate criminal laws and procedures, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2, line 16, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$130,000" and insert "\$120,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee

thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of criminal laws and procedures.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO FEDERAL CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 234) to consider matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 234

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$8,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

The resolution (S. Res. 239) to study and examine the Federal judicial system was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act

of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to improve the operations of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$203,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 238) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2, line 16, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$185,000" and insert "\$170,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$170,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider resolution (S. Res. 248) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2, line 23, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$426,800" and insert "\$400,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. RES. 248

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$400,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 240) to investigate juvenile delinquency, which had been reported from the Committee on Judiciary, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$235,000" and insert "\$225,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical and other assistants and consultants; *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$225,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

The resolution (S. Res. 242) to investigate national penitentiaries was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 242

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1)

to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF THE STATUTES RELATING TO PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

The resolution (S. Res. 241) to examine and review the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PROBLEMS CREATED BY FLOW OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 243) to investigate problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees from communistic tyranny, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 2,

line 17, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$108,215" and insert "\$105,400"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of refugees and escapees.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, on a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$105,400, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 244) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 244

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$46,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PROFESSIONAL AND CLERICAL STAFF FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 220) to provide additional professional and clerical staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration; and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are on page 1, line 3, after the word "employ" insert "one additional assistant chief clerk," at the beginning of line 4, strike out "three" and insert "six"; and in the same line after the word "and" strike out "three" and insert "seven".

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration are on page 1, line 9, after the word "of" strike out "Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended"; and insert "Public Law 90-57, approved July 28, 1967, as amended"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, six additional professional staff members and seven additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 90-57, approved July 28, 1967, as amended.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING OF INDIAN EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 218) to authorize funding of Indian Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without amendment; and from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is on page 1, line 8, after the word "education" strike out "and related problems"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a

complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the education of Indian children.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PROVISION FOR THE STUDY OF MIGRATORY LABOR

The resolution (S. Res. 222) to provide for the study of migratory labor was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 222

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such matters as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 229) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make certain investigations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 229

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, including studies of mechanization, modernization, personnel policies, utilization of manpower, hours, wages, work schedules, and management techniques, designed to improve postal service in the United States;

(2) the Federal civil service, including retirement and general consideration of legislation to improve the quality of Federal employment and Federal personnel policies and practices; and

(3) committee jurisdiction concerning the census and the collection of statistics.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, until January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments and agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$150,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The resolution (S. Res. 230) to provide funds for the Committee on Public Works was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 230

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads

and highways, water pollution, air pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development and economic growth.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$160,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL STUDIES BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 250) to authorize certain additional studies by the Committee on Public Works, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment; and from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is on page 1, line 3, after the word "Works" insert "from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That, in furtherance of the understanding of matters coming within its jurisdiction, the Committee on Public Works, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized to contract with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations and with individuals for the purpose of conducting a study or studies relating to the movement of commuter traffic into and out of the Washington, District of Columbia, metropolitan area, to study the relationship between highway facilities and other modes of commuter services in the movement of people from those areas beyond the proposed range of projected mass transit and urban freeway facilities, to the disposal of solid waste originating in the Washington, District of Columbia, metropolitan area by such manner and means as will obviate air and water pollution in the Washington, District of Columbia, metropolitan area, all designed to measure the impact of proposals which will affect various programs authorized by the Committee on Public Works pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, air pollution, solid waste disposal, public buildings, and all features of water resource development and economic growth: *Provided, however*, That neither the conduct of this study nor any of its observations, conclusions, findings, or recommendations shall in any way reexamine, delay, compete, or interfere with the rapid transit system planned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The Committee on Public Works will coordinate its activities

with the activities of other committees of the Senate having legislative jurisdiction related to the general subject matter of the study or studies to be undertaken.

Sec. 2. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$135,000.00, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 210) authorizing additional funds for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 210

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
- (2) corrupt practices;
- (3) contested elections;
- (4) credentials and qualifications;
- (5) Federal elections generally; and
- (6) presidential succession.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and the personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

The resolution (S. Res. 224) to study the Standing Rules of the Senate was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the Standing Rules of the United States Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$67,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESSES

The resolution (S. Res. 215) authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a complete study of the problems of small and independent businesses was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended and supplemented, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1968, to January 31, 1969, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$145,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGING

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 223) to provide for the study of the problems of the aging, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 3, line 6, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$230,000" and insert "\$200,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

S. Res. 223

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging, established by the Senate Resolution

33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1969.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems and opportunities of older people, including but not limited to, problems and opportunities of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of obtaining care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

Sec. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized (1) to employ on a temporary basis from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$2,300 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (2) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$200,000, from February 1, 1968, through January 31, 1969, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1969. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1969.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 247) continuing the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress through December 31, 1968, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "through" strike out "December 31, 1968" and insert "June 30, 1968"; in line 9, after the word "through" strike out "December 31, 1968" and insert "June 30, 1968"; at the beginning of line 11, strike out "Decem-

ber 31, 1968" and insert "June 30, 1968"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed" strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$50,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established by S. Res. 293, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to August 26, 1966 (as amended and supplemented), is hereby continued through June 30, 1968.

Sec. 2. The special committee is hereby authorized to exercise the powers conferred upon it by section 2 of S. Res. 311, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to October 17, 1966, through June 30, 1968. The expenses of the special committee from February 1, 1968, through June 30, 1968, shall not exceed \$50,000, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the special committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A resolution continuing the Special Committee on the Organization of the Congress through June 30, 1968."

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTES ON RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the votes by which all the resolutions were agreed to today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the request of the Senator from Louisiana for the reconsideration of those votes be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request to lay on the table is agreed to.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE'S 1968 BUDGET

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to thank Senators for adopting Senate Resolution 240, continuing the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

In this session, we have already begun important hearings on LSD and marihuana control.

We must plan to continue the hearings started last year on juvenile auto theft.

We are investigating the scandalous conditions in many of the Nation's juvenile correctional institutions.

We plan hearings on the mounting problem of youth violence. And, we must carry on and complete other investigations regarding current Federal programs on the control and prevention of juvenile delinquency.

And, finally, we must obtain the passage of our much-needed firearms legislation.

Crime, delinquency, and violence are the most distressing internal problems facing our Nation.

The latest Gallup Poll, released on February 27, 1968, shows that for the first time crime, delinquency, and lawlessness top the list of domestic problems which concern our people.

Every Senator knows that the letters they receive on the crime problem re-

flect deep-seated fears, anxieties, and often sheer panic among their constituents regarding the safety of their children and their families.

These fears are backed up by juvenile court figures and FBI statistics on youth crime. Both have registered continuous increases for over a decade with another 7-percent spurt in 1966.

These fears among the public are intensified by the new knowledge that crimes of violence among young people have grown even more drastically than any other types of offenses. While arrests for all serious crimes for the under-18-year-old group have increased 54 percent since 1960, crimes against the person have soared 78 percent during the same time.

These are fears that cannot and should not be neglected by the Congress. If we do, we will seriously undermine the inner strength and stability of the Nation.

I am pleased the Senate acted as it did because delinquency and violence cannot be wiped out overnight and because in many of our control efforts, we can only proceed one step at a time.

We must build on existing laws and past accomplishments and we must react to new outbreaks and new developments.

Last year, we reported a strong firearms bill out of the subcommittee. Senators know that this has been one of the most difficult pieces of legislation to face Congress in a long time. We thought we had concluded the hearings, that all the information was in, then the administration sent down a new amendment, Senator Hruska, our ranking minority member, introduced two other bills and we were forced into 10 additional days of hearings on the firearms problem.

In this session, we are still faced with the prospect of new amendments to this bill before its final enactment.

The drug problem is another issue that confronts us this year.

In 1965, we passed the drug abuse control amendments, and in 1966 we helped pass the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. We knew then that the subcommittee would need further hearings to determine the adequacy of these laws and to determine the need for new legislation.

Recent studies on LSD have shown the possibility that this drug may have far reaching, crippling effects on generations yet unborn.

The dramatic increase in marihuana abuse all over the Nation even among young people of high school age demands a new look at the Federal controls over this drug. This is the drug causing the most serious problems among our youth and yet none of the recent proposals in the drug field attempt to review our laws and controls with respect to marihuana.

Another hearing we must have involves juvenile correctional institutions. We are rapidly moving into a period where increasingly more Federal aid is being proposed for state and local delinquency control and treatment programs. Yet, today more than ever, we receive reports of scandalous conditions and intolerable abuses in these institutions.

We know that detention homes and training schools are used as "dumping grounds" for young people by many juvenile courts.

In a related development, we must now face the inadequacies in our Nation's juvenile court procedures as highlighted by the Gault decision of 1967. In this case, the Supreme Court struck down a number of unconstitutional and arbitrary practices in an Arizona case that could have been found almost anywhere in the Nation.

Last year, I introduced the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act for the administration. Based on subcommittee studies, I later proposed amendments to that act.

While I know that these measures will move us in the right direction, I also know that we need an even more comprehensive inquiry into the new delinquency control programs we are proposing to assure a unified Federal effort instead of a disconcerted piecemeal dissipation of funds and energy.

This matter will involve further investigation and research in 1968.

Then, there is the problem of youth violence.

We have seen ample evidence of this rampaging violence in our riot-torn cities, in resort areas filled with unruly youths, on college campuses, and in other areas where draftcard burning and similar manifestations of misguided protest have become normal occurrences.

The Senate and the House must react to this problem; we must determine the motivations of those involved; and we must seek to restrain it. No Senate committee has held hearings on this specific issue, and I plan to fill this gap in 1968.

Further, we will need followup hearings on auto theft. This is a crime which overwhelmingly involves the youth of this country and the subcommittee must make an effort to find new preventive measures against this offense which often starts young teenagers into careers in crime. At the same time, we must verify earlier promises by the automobile industry that proper auto theft devices will be installed in newly produced passenger cars.

Finally, we will need to deal with the persistent pornography nuisance by considering Federal legislation to outlaw the sale and distribution of obscene publications to minors.

These are the most important matters that confront the subcommittee in 1968. We have a small staff and a modest budget. And, I think the problem of juvenile delinquency fully warrants the kind of study and investigation by the Senate that is carried on by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

I am submitting for the information of other Senators and for inclusion in the RECORD at this point a list of 12 legislative measures that have been either proposed, processed, or are in the drafting stage by the subcommittee since January 1967.

These include five bills to regulate the runaway interstate traffic in firearms—S. 1, amendment No. 90; S. 1853, S. 1854 and amendment No. 361.

A bill (S. 1425) to control the mailing

of obscene advertisements to young people;

A bill (S. 2950) to outlaw the interstate traffic in automobile master keys; and

A comprehensive six-part amendment to S. 1248, the proposed Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

In addition, based on subcommittee studies, we have drafted four new bills to prevent and control auto theft, to develop new regulations over the handling of LSD and other dangerous drugs, and to protect our young people from the pornography peddlers.

The subcommittee conducted 17 days of hearings on several of these bills in 1967 and we are prepared to hold more hearings on the other bills in 1968.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary report by the subcommittee be printed in the RECORD, also a history of subcommittee legislation beginning in 1955 and including the period of my chairmanship from 1961 through 1966.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY REPORT OF LEGISLATION PROCESSED BY THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE DURING THE 90TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

1967

Five bills to control the interstate traffic in firearms

1. S. 1—A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Senators Dodd, Clark, Fong, Javits, Edward Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Smathers and Tydings). Referred to the Judiciary Committee. Hearings concluded by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

2. Amendment No. 90 to S. 1—A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Senators Dodd, Clark, Fong, Edward Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Smathers and Tydings). Referred to the Judiciary Committee. Ordered reported to the Judiciary Committee, September 20, 1967.

3. Amendment No. 361 to S. 1—Amendment No. 90—to allow any state to exempt itself from the provisions of Amendment No. 90 restricting the mail order trade in certain types of rifles and shotguns (Senator Dodd). Referred to the Judiciary Committee. Hearings concluded by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

4. S. 1853—A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Senator Hruska). Referred to the Judiciary Committee. Hearings concluded by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

5. S. 1854—A bill to amend the National Firearms Act (Senator Hruska). Referred to the Judiciary Committee. Hearings concluded by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

A bill to prohibit obscene advertisements in the mails to juveniles

6. S. 1425—A bill to amend Title 18 of the United States Code by prohibiting pandering advertisements in the mails. (Senators Dodd, Bayh, Fong and Thurmond). Referred to the Judiciary Committee. Hearings concluded by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. A similar bill was passed as part of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967. (P.L. 90-206, December 16, 1967).

A bill to control the interstate traffic in automobile master keys

7. S. 2950—A bill to amend Title 18 of the United States Code by prescribing criminal penalties for the illegal manufacture and interstate distribution of automobile master keys (Senator Dodd). Hearings concluded by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

Amendment to S. 1248 the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act

8. Amendment to S. 1248—*The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, to provide for the training and recruitment of personnel in the juvenile correctional field to develop a model juvenile correctional system, to provide Federal assistance for juvenile courts probation departments and correctional institutions and to incorporate new methods of delinquency prevention in the public school system.* (Senator Dodd). Hearings concluded by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty.

A bill to provide anti-theft devices on new automobiles

9. A bill drafted by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee to require automobile manufacturers to install anti-theft devices in newly produced passenger cars. (Hearings to be held)

A bill to provide new penalties for the illegal handling of LSD and dangerous drugs

10. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act by prescribing penalties for the illegal manufacture, distribution and possession of LSD and other dangerous drugs and for other purposes. Hearings currently being held by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

A bill to revise Federal laws relating to marijuana and other dangerous drugs

11. A bill under consideration by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee to revise Federal laws relating to the control of marijuana, LSD and other dangerous drugs. Hearings currently being held by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

A bill to outlaw sale of obscene publications to minors

12. A bill under consideration by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee setting forth specific restrictions and penalties pertaining to the sale and distribution of pornographic publications to minors.

SUBCOMMITTEE LEGISLATION PASSED INTO LAW
1955

S. 600.—A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing and transportation of obscene matter. Hearings held by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee in 1955, and reported favorably. This bill was passed and became Public Law 95, 84th Congress, 1st Session, and was signed by the President on June 28, 1955.

1957

S. 1659.—A bill to enact the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act in the District of Columbia. Introduced as a result of hearings by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee; referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Passed the Senate; signed into law by the President on July 10, 1957. (Public Law 85-94)

1958

S. 2558.—A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interstate traffic in switchblade knives and to prevent these instruments from falling into the hands of juveniles. Introduced as a result of hearings by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee; referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Hearings were held and the bill was reported favorably and passed the Senate; signed into law by the President on August 12, 1958. (Public Law 85-823)

S. 3667.—A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing or causing the delivery by mail of obscene matter to minors. (Senators Kefauver and Langer; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; H.R. 6239, a similar bill which had passed the House of Representatives, was also referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; this bill (H.R. 6239) was amended, incorporated

ing the provisions of S. 3667, and reported favorably; the amended bill passed the Senate; the House disagreed with the Senate amendments and the measure went to conference; the conference report was submitted and agreed to by both Houses; signed into law by the President on August 28, 1958. (Public Law 85-796)

1961

S. 802.—A bill to provide Federal assistance for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. (Senators Dodd, Kefauver, Carroll, and Hart—referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.) Reported to Senate as S. 279 on April 6, 1961, Senate Report 144. Passed Senate April 12, 1961, and referred to House Committee on Education and Labor. Committee discharged. Passed House, amended, August 30, 1961. Senate agreed to House amendments September 11, 1961. Approved September 22, 1961. (Public Law 87-274)

S. 1953.—A bill to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code, setting aside conviction of youth offenders released from probation. Passed into law, October 3, 1961. (Public Law 87-336)

1962

S. 1691.—A bill to provide that any juvenile who has been determined delinquent by a district court of the United States may be committed by the court to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study. Passed into law, March 31, 1961. (Public Law 87-428)

1963

S. 1319.—A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents. Passed into law, December 30, 1963. (Public Law 88-251)

Subcommittee legislation which passed the Senate or became public law—1964—1965—1966

1964

S. 2628.—"Psychotoxic Drug Control Act of 1964". Passed the Senate August 15, 1964, and referred to House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1541.—A bill to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption. Passed the Senate, September 28, 1964.

Summary report of legislation acted on by the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee during 1965

1. "1965 Drug control amendments" (Public Law 89-74).—The Subcommittee devoted much effort to the final passage on July 8, 1965 of the "1965 Drug Control Amendments"—a law that was developed by the Subcommittee after several years of investigation into the uncontrolled and indiscriminate manufacture, sale and distribution of dangerous drugs.

2. *Exclusion of Peyote from the 1965 drug amendments.*—Further investigations were conducted with respect to the widespread smuggling of narcotics and dangerous drugs into this country from abroad with a new emphasis on the developing traffic in hallucinogenic drugs. As a result of this investigation the 1965 Drug Control Act was amended to include peyote under its provisions. Further legislation is being drafted to cover new drugs of addiction which are not included in the present Federal Law.

3. *Interstate adoption legislation.*—The Senate passed Subcommittee Bill S. 624, the "Black Market Baby Bill" on March 22, 1965.

4. "State firearms control assistance amendments of 1965".—The Subcommittee held extensive hearings regarding the Administration's Bill S. 1592 which proposes sweeping revisions of the Federal Firearms Act. Hearings lasted 11 days during which 48 witnesses presented testimony before the Subcommittee. Because of the pointed oppo-

sition to this measure its consideration involved a large amount of research, travel, preparation and handling of correspondence by the staff of the Subcommittee.

5. "The Narcotics Rehabilitation Act of 1965".—During the latter part of the year the Subcommittee undertook preparation for the hearings with respect to S. 2152, "The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965", introduced by the Chairman on behalf of the Administration. These hearings were commenced on January 25, 1966 and continued for several months into 1966.

Summary report of legislation acted on by the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee during 1966

1. "State firearms control assistance amendments of 1966".—The Subcommittee continued its efforts to pass the Administration's bill S. 1592 which proposes sweeping revisions of the Federal Firearms Act. As in 1965 the controversial nature of this measure resulted in extensive research, travel, preparation and handling of correspondence by the staff of the Subcommittee. This effort led to the reporting of the bill by the Subcommittee to the full Committee.

2. "The Narcotics Rehabilitation Act of 1966" (P.L. 89-793).—During 1966 the Subcommittee held 12 days of hearings with respect to S. 2152, "The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966," introduced by the Chairman on behalf of the Administration. This measure was signed into law on November 8, 1966.

3. S. 3183.—A bill prescribing criminal penalties for illegal importation of dangerous drugs.—Based on its investigations the Subcommittee prepared this legislation which was introduced by the Chairman to reduce the traffic of stimulant and depressant drugs into the United States from Mexico.

4. S. 1425.—A bill to amend Title 18 of the U.S. Code in order to proscribe the mailing of certain matter not desired by addressees.—Investigations and hearings which led to the introduction of this legislation were begun in late 1966 on Youth, Obscene Materials and the United States Mails.

ELIMINATION OF RESERVE REQUIREMENTS—S. 2857 INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 987, S. 2857, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and S. 2857 is indefinitely postponed.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia assumed the chair.)

VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the honorable Eugene V. Rostow is Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and as such is one of the principal advisers to the President on Vietnam policy. At a committee meeting this morning I put this question to Mr. Rostow:

In your judgment, is U.S. involvement in a long war in Vietnam advantageous to the Soviet Union?

Mr. Rostow answered categorically with one word: "No."

It is important, I think, that the Congress and the American people know the thinking of those who determine policy and strategy regarding the Vietnam war. So I have put that question to almost every important civilian who has a major role in determining Vietnam policy.

Most have not been as frank as Mr. Rostow, but under persistent questioning in committee I usually obtain the same answer as Mr. Rostow gave.

I commend Mr. Rostow for his candor; I admire his frankness. He is an honorable, able, and hard-working public official.

But I disagree completely with his judgment.

To me, U.S. involvement in a long war is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union. If our policymakers do not recognize that, then how in the world are we ever going to bring this war to an early conclusion?

We have been heavily involved in ground fighting for 3 years.

For the year 1966, the United States suffered 35,000 casualties; for 1967, the United States suffered 71,000 casualties. Thus, during that 2-year period, American casualties averaged 1,000 per week.

Now we come to 1968.

For the first 10 weeks of 1968, U.S. casualties have averaged 2,400 per week—for a total of 24,076 for the period January 1 through March 9.

To me it is obvious that the way the war has been conducted has prolonged the conflict and increased the casualties.

For example, in the matter of shutting off supplies to the enemy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff all have formally recommended to the President that we shut off supplies going through Haiphong. That recommendation was made months ago and is still the considered judgment of these military leaders.

Can the President continue to justify his complete disregard of the recommendation of his top military advisers in so fundamental a military matter as shutting off supplies to the enemy?

The public, I feel, does not understand why this Great Nation, with all the military resources we have, and with the great expenditure of life and money we are making, is not able to handle a small Asiatic nation which one would need to stretch a point to call a minor world power.

A greater tonnage of bombs has been dropped on Vietnam than on all of Europe during World War II. Eighty-five percent of this tonnage was dropped on South Vietnam, only 10 percent on North Vietnam—the remaining 5 percent on Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos.

The strategy of self-imposed restrictions with the rising casualties and the unending need of troops—yes, the failure of this strategy—demands that the President act promptly to give full support to our troops, particularly by authorizing the shutting off of supplies going through the North Vietnamese ports.

For 2 years now, Mr. President, I have been convinced that this war is not likely to be brought to an early conclusion until our Government recognizes what to me seems so basic: That U.S. involvement in a long war in Vietnam, with depletion of our manpower and treasure, is advantageous to the Soviet Union, which is the dominant threat to the security of the United States.

Yet, it is clear to me from my dialog today with Under Secretary of State Rostow that despite the deteriorating political and military situation in Vietnam, blind adherence is still being given to the old theories and policies, the failure of which seems evident.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of yesterday, March 14, 1968, that the Senate adjourn until 12 noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 18, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15, 1968:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

H. Gardner Ackley, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Archie A. Hoffman, FR19222, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. John M. McNabb, FR5037, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John L. Martin, Jr., FR7556, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, Jr., FR8660, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee V. Gossick, FR8679, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee M. Lightner, FR18923, Regular Air Force, Dental.

Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, FR9961, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard F. Schaefer, FR10096, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Daniel E. Riley, FR3768, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George E. Brown, FR4425, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Roland A. Campbell, FR4535, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph J. Kruzel, FR4640, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward M. Nichols, Jr., FR7805, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry B. Kucheman, Jr., FR8353, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John E. Morrison, Jr., FR8459, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward B. Giller, FR8696, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John R. Murphy, FR8944, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frederick E. Morris, Jr., FR9166, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Louis T. Seith, FR9756, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Sherman F. Martin, FR9963, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edmund F. O'Connor, FR10200, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Burl W. McLaughlin, FR10624, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jammie M. Philpott, FR13694, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Archie M. Burke, FR4642 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Curtis, FR7448 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Pete C. Sianis, FR7945 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gerald W. Johnson, FR8671 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Courtney L. Faught, FR8781 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lester F. Miller, FR9004 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward A. McGough III, FR9819 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James F. Hackler, Jr., FR9839 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Winton W. Marshall, FR9999 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. James B. Nuttall, FR19239, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Charles H. Snider, FR19009, Regular Air Force, Veterinary.

Col. Louis G. Griffin, FR4403, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard G. Bulgin, FR4902, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert L. Cardenas, FR5056, Regular Air Force.

Col. John French, FR5210, Regular Air Force.

Col. Maurice A. Cristadoro, FR7920, Regular Air Force.

Col. George P. Cole, FR8093, Regular Air Force.

Col. Alex W. Talmant, FR9082, Regular Air Force.

Col. Spencer S. Hunn, FR9442, Regular Air Force.

Col. Fred W. Vetter, Jr., FR9719, Regular Air Force.

Col. Rexford H. Dettre, Jr., FR9768, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edmund B. Edwards, FR9787, Regular Air Force.

Col. Chester J. Butcher, FR9846, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert J. Holbury, FR9893, Regular Air Force.

Col. Arthur W. Holderness, Jr., FR10095, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robin Olds, FR10128, Regular Air Force.

Col. William G. King, Jr., FR8356, Regular Air Force.

Col. George W. McLaughlin, FR8796, Regular Air Force.

Col. Henry J. Stehling, FR9197, Regular Air Force.

Col. Cleo M. Bishop, FR9777, Regular Air Force.

Col. Roger K. Rhodarmer, FR9921, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edwin L. Little, FR9977, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jonas L. Blank, FR10119, Regular Air Force.

Col. Clare T. Ireland, Jr., FR10123, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harvey W. Eddy, FR10912, Regular Air Force.

Col. Eugene A. Stalzer, FR11347, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edwin S. Wittbrodt, FR33201, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard N. Cordell, FR33228, Regular Air Force.

Col. David L. Carter, FR12035, Regular Air Force.

Col. James G. Silliman, FR22644, Regular Air Force.

Col. John W. Baska, FR33311, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harry C. Bayne, FR12289, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas B. Kennedy, FR12723, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert V. Spencer, FR13230, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard M. Hoban, FR23658, Regular Air Force.

Col. Theodore S. Coberly, FR33954, Regular Air Force.

Col. Theodore S. Coberly, FR33954, Regular Air Force.

Col. John O. Moench, FR14318, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Sanford K. Moats, FR14948, Regular Air Force.
 Col. James A. Bailey, FR49199, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Maurice R. Reilly, FR15624, Regular Air Force.
 Col. George H. McKee, FR15663, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert E. Halls, FR15775, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Alan C. Edmunds, FR15875, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Donald E. Stout, FR16198, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Harold R. Johnson, FR16208, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Alfred L. Esposito, FR16278, Regular Air Force.
 Col. John C. Giraudo, FR16296, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Donald H. Ross, FR16313, Regular Air Force.
 Col. James A. Hill, FR24324, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Jimmy J. Jumper, FR35078, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Robert W. Maloy, FR16580 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Alton D. Slay, FR17201 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Jonah Lebell, FR19786 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Abraham J. Dreisesz, FR36902 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Warner E. Newby, FR37082 (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Ralph T. Holland, FR37362 (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
 Col. Lee M. Paschall, FR38002 (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Maurice Candide Fournier, O1167424.
 Brig. Gen. William Percival Levine, O1055895.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Merrill Brown Evans, O545711, Infantry.
 Col. Arthur Elberg Hutchinson, O1174003, Artillery.
 Col. David Bernard Kelly, O1013091, Armor.
 Col. Ivan Adam Reitz, O739856, Civil Affairs.

Col. Roger Emerson Whitcomb, O350552, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. James Taylor Hardin, O388679.
 Brig. Gen. James DeWitt Scott, O381931.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Albert White Adams, O338796, Artillery.
 Col. Thomas Donald Blackwell, O405117, Infantry.
 Col. Oral Lee Davis, O1165277, Quartermaster Corps.
 Col. Thomas Onas Lawson, O393290, Armor.
 Col. Paul Victor Meyer, O425206, Infantry.
 Col. Bernard Andrew Nurre, O1318073, Infantry.
 Col. Leonard Cecil Ward, O374608, Corps of Engineers.
 Col. Leonard Fish Wing, Jr., O1326177, Armor.
 Col. Edward Francis Wozenski, O351415, Infantry.

IN THE NATIONAL GUARD

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be brigadier general

Col. Joseph Gale May, O961583, Adjutant General's Corps.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Joseph B. McDevitt, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

The following-named officer, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Rear Adm. Reynold D. Hogle, U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. Charles K. Duncan, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel for a term of 4 years pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5141.

Rear Adm. Walter D. Gaddis, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

The following-named Reserve officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Ralph S. Garrison States M. Mead
 Stewart W. Hopkins Chester H. Taylor, Jr.

Edelen A. Parker William S. Mailliard
 John H. Hoefler A. Atley Peterson
 Jim K. Carpenter Dallas F. Jordan

MEDICAL CORPS

Robert A. Conard, Jr.
 Richard H. Kiene
 Robert E. Switzer

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles W. Shattuck J. Edwin Gay
 Leslie T. Maiman Paul N. Howell

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Ray C. Tindall

DENTAL CORPS

Francis J. Fabrizio

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Herman Nickerson, Jr., USMC, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Charles F. Duchain
 Sidney S. McMath

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Leland W. Smith
 Arthur B. Hanson

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Jack Edwards, to be major, and ending Carl T. Zimmerman, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 19, 1968.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Charles J. Haas, to be second lieutenant, and ending F. Gordon Zophy II, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 14, 1968; and

The nominations beginning William H. Scanlan, to be captain, and ending Deems C. Watkins, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 14, 1968.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Peter A. Acly, to be first lieutenant, and ending Paul J. Zohlen, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 14, 1968.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

West Virginia Interstate Highway System Development Is Clarified and Agreement Reached on Routes—Appalachian Program Will Progress

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is extensive interest and much discussion in West Virginia and elsewhere in the country concerning the Interstate Highway System mileage assigned to West Virginia and in the routing of segments

of that system through our State. This is understandable. West Virginia has great need for accelerated development of its assigned interstate highway segments and for advancing faster in the approved Appalachian developmental highway corridors. The segmental gaps in West Virginia present problems of national concern especially as these relate to I-70, I-77, I-64, and I-79, so it is natural that the interest in their progress extends well beyond the State's borders. Discussion of the subject seems too frequently to be predicated on inadequate information or misinformation. The facts seem to be too little known.

Because of these conditions, I requested the Federal Highway Adminis-

tration of the U.S. Department of Transportation to do research on the subject and to issue a report to me as a Senator from West Virginia and as chairman of the Committee on Public Works and its Subcommittee on Roads. I have received in response an informative and factual statement from Lowell K. Bridwell, our able Federal Highway Administrator, delineating the nationwide perspective of the Interstate Highway System and providing historical facts relating to the West Virginia segments of Interstates 64, 70, 470, 81, 77, and 79.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a substantial portion of the briefing state-